arXiv:0812.1573v1 [math.AP] 8 Dec 2008

MEAN CURVATURE MOTION OF GRAPHS WITH CONSTANT CONTACT ANGLE AT A FREE BOUNDARY

by A. Freire
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Abstract

We consider the motion by mean curvature of an n-dimensional graph over a time-dependent domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, intersecting $\mathbb{R}^n$ at a constant angle. In the general case, we prove local existence for the corresponding quasilinear parabolic equation with a free boundary, and derive a continuation criterion based on the second fundamental form. If the initial graph is concave, we show this is preserved, and that the solution exists only for finite time. This corresponds to a symmetric version of mean curvature motion of a network of hypersurfaces with triple junctions, with constant contact angle at the junctions.

1. Time-dependent graphs with a contact angle condition.

We consider a moving hypersurface Σ_t in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, with normal velocity equal to its mean curvature, assumed to be a graph over a time-dependent open set $D(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (not necessarily bounded, or connected.) The (properly embedded) $(n-1)$-submanifold of intersection:

$$\Gamma(t) = \Sigma_t \cap \mathbb{R}^n = \partial D(t)$$

is a 'moving boundary'. Along $\Gamma(t)$ we impose a constant-angle condition:

$$\langle N, e_{n+1} \rangle_{|\Gamma(t)} = \beta,$$

where $0 < \beta < 1$ is a *constant* and N is the upward unit normal of Σ_t. 'Mean curvature motion' is defined by the law:

$$V_N = H,$$

where $V_N = \langle V, N \rangle$, with $V = \partial_t F$ the velocity vector in a given parametrization $F(t)$ of Σ_t (V depends on the parametrization, while V_N does not). A particular parametrization yields 'mean curvature flow':

$$\partial_t F = HN.$$

For graphs, it is natural to consider 'graph mean curvature motion': if $\Sigma_t =$ graph $w(t)$ for a function $w(t) : D(t) \to \mathbb{R}$, imposing $\langle \partial_t F, N \rangle = H$ with $F(y,t) = [y, w(y,t)]$ for $y \in D(t)$, we find:

$$w_t = \sqrt{1 + |Dw|^2} H$$

(and the velocity is vertical, $\partial_t F = w_t e_{n+1}$). With the contact angle condition, we obtain a free boundary problem for a quasilinear PDE:

$$\begin{cases} w_t = g^{ij}(Dw)w_{ij} \quad \text{in } D(t), \\ w = 0, \quad \beta\sqrt{1+|Dw|^2} = 1 \text{ on } \partial D(t), \end{cases}$$

where $g^{ij}(Dw) = \delta^{ij} - w_i w_j/(1+|Dw|^2)$ is the inverse metric matrix.

Remark 1.1. It is easy to see that the constant-angle boundary condition is *incompatible* with mean curvature flow parametrized over a *fixed* domain D_0: on ∂D_0 we would have $\langle F, e_{n+1}\rangle = 0$, leading to $\langle \partial_t F, e_{n+1}\rangle = 0$, incompatible with $\partial_t F = HN$ and $\langle N, e_{n+1}\rangle = \beta$. If we parametrize over a time-dependent domain, mean curvature flow leads to a normal velocity for the moving boundary that is difficult to control; hence we chose to analyze the geometry of the motion in terms of the 'graph m.c.m.' parametrization.

To establish short-time existence (in parabolic Hölder spaces) we will work with a third parametrization of the motion, defined over a fixed domain:

$$F(t): D_0 \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \quad F(x,t) = [\varphi(x,t), u(x,t)] \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R},$$

where $\varphi(t) : D_0 \to D(t)$ is a diffeomorphism and F is a solution of the parabolic system:

$$F_t = g^{ij}(DF)F_{ij},$$

where $g_{ij} = \langle F_i, F_j\rangle$ is the induced metric on Σ_t and g^{ij} is the inverse metric matrix.

In the first part of the paper (sections 3 to 8) we prove the following short-time existence theorem (on $Q := D_0 \times [0,T]$):

Theorem 1.1. Let $\Sigma_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a $C^{3+\bar{\alpha}}$ graph over $D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the contact and angle conditions at ∂D_0. There exists a parametrization $F_0 = [\varphi_0, u_0] \in C^{2+\alpha}(D_0)$ of Σ_0 (where $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}^2$ and φ_0 is a diffeomorphism of D_0 satisfying the 'orthogonality conditions' on ∂D_0), $T > 0$ depending only on Σ_0 and a unique solution $F \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\alpha/2}(Q^T; \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ of the system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t F - g^{ij}(DF)\partial_i\partial_j F = 0, \quad F = [\varphi, u] \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \\ u_{|\partial D_0} = 0, \quad N^{n+1}(DF)_{|\partial D_0} = \beta, \end{cases}$$

with initial data F_0 and where $\varphi(t) : D_0 \to D(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a diffeomorphism satisfying, in addition, the 'orthogonality conditions' at ∂D_0 (described in section 3.)

The system and boundary conditions are discussed in more detail in section 3. Sections 4, 5, and 6 deal with compatibility at $t = 0$, linearization and the verification that the boundary conditions satisfy 'complementarity'. In particular, adjusting the initial diffeomorphism φ_0 to ensure compatibility (section 4) leads to the 'loss of differentiability' seen in theorem 1.1. The required estimates in Hölder spaces for the linearized system are described in section 7, and the proof concluded (by a fixed-point argument) in section 8. While the general scheme is standard, since we are dealing with a free boundary problem with somewhat non-standard boundary conditions, details are included. Free boundary-type problems for mean curvature motion of graphs have apparently not previously been considered.

We describe the evolution equations in the rotationally symmetric case in section 9 (including a stationary example for the exterior problem) and the extension to the case of a graph motion Σ_t intersecting fixed support hypersurfaces orthogonally in section 10.

The original motivation for this work was to establish (by classical parabolic PDE methods) existence-uniqueness for mean curvature motion of networks of surfaces meeting along triple junctions with constant-angle conditions. One can use a motion Σ_t of graphs with constant contact angle to produce examples of 'triple junction motion': three hypersurfaces moving by mean curvature meeting along an $(n-1)$-dimensional submanifold $\Sigma(t)$ so that the three normals make constant angles (say, 120 degrees) along $\Gamma(t)$. We simply reflect on $\mathbb{R}^n$, so the hypersurfaces are $\Sigma_t, \bar{\Sigma}_t$ and $\mathbb{R}^n - \bar{D}(t)$. If $\Sigma_t = \text{graph } w(t)$ with $w > 0$, the system is *embedded* in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. This is mean curvature motion of a 'symmetric triple junction of graphs'.

Short-time existence holds for general triple junctions of graphs moving by mean curvature with constant 120 degree angles at the junction, provided a compatibility condition holds along the junction (see section 16). Since the free-boundary problem is easier to understand in the symmetric case, we decided to do this first. In addition, in the present case it is possible to go further towards a geometric global existence result. Motivated by recent work on 'lens-type' curve networks [7], in the second part of the paper (sections 11-15) we consider continuation criteria and preservation of concavity. Since we chose to develop these results for graph motion with a free boundary, although the general lines of proof (via maximum principles) have precedents, the details of the arguments are new. For example, section 12 contains an extension of the maximum principle for symmetric tensors with Neumann-type boundary conditions given in [13], which in our setting allows one to show preservation of weak concavity in general. Section 14 includes a continuation criterion for the flow. The results obtained in sections 11-15 are summarized in the following theorem. (h denotes the second fundamental form, pulled back to a symmetric 2-tensor on $D(t)$.)

Theorem 1.2. If Σ_0 is weakly concave ($h \leq 0$ at $t = 0$), this is preserved by the evolution. Let T_{max} be the maximal existence time for the evolution. If the mean curvature of Σ_0 is strictly negative ($\sup_{\Sigma_0} H = H_0 < 0$), then T_{max} is finite. Assuming $T_{max} < \infty$, we have:

$$\limsup_{t \to T_{max}} [\sup_{\Gamma_t} (|h|_g + |\nabla^{tan} h^{tan}|_g)] = \infty$$

(if $n = 2$, in the concave case). If there is no 'gradient blowup' at T_{max}, the hypersurface contracts to a compact convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $t \to T_{max}$.

Remark 1.2. We have not yet proved that the diameter tends to zero as $t \to T_{max}$, though this seems likely based on the experience with curves [7] (in the absence of 'gradient blowup'.) It is an interesting question (even in the concave case, for $n = 2$) whether the latter can really occur (that is, $\sup_{\Gamma_t} |\nabla^{tan} h^{tan}|_g \to \infty$ as $t \to T_{max}$, while $|h|_g$ remains bounded on Γ_t.)

Acknowledgments. It is a pleasure to thank Nicholas Alikakos for originally proposing to consider the problem of mean curvature flow for networks of surfaces meeting at constant angles, and for his interest in this work. Most of the work on short-time existence was done during a stay at the Max-Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics in Golm (January-June, 2007); I am grateful to the Max-Planck Society for supporting the visit and to the Geometric Analysis group at the AEI for the invitation. Finally, thanks to Mariel Sáez for communicating the results of the Lens Seminar ([7]) and of her recent work on mean curvature flow of networks (partly in collaboration with Rafe Mazzeo, [11]).

2. Normal velocity of the moving boundary. The evolution is naturally supplied with initial data Σ_0, a graph meeting $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ at the prescribed angle. Since we are interested in classical solutions in the parabolic Hölder space $C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}$, we expect an additional compatibility condition at $t = 0$. We discuss this first for graph m.c.m. $w(y, t)$.

Denote by $\Gamma(t)$ a global parametrization of $\partial D(t)$ (with domain in a fixed manifold, and 'space variables' left implicit). Differentiating in t the 'contact condition' $w(\Gamma(t), t) = 0$, we find:

$$w_t + \langle Dw, \dot{\Gamma}(t) \rangle = 0.$$

Denote by $n = n_t$ the unit normal vector field to $\Gamma(t)$, chosen so that the directional derivative $d_n w > 0$. The contact condition also implies the gradient of w is purely normal:

$$Dw_{|\partial D(t)} = (d_n w)n.$$

Combining this with the angle condition, and bearing in mind that $d_n w_{|\Gamma(t)} > 0$, we find:

$$d_n w = \frac{\beta_0}{\beta} \text{ on } \partial D(t), \quad \beta_0 := \sqrt{1-\beta^2}.$$

(In fact, this is a more convenient form of the 'angle' boundary condition for w, since it is linear.) Thus, on $\partial D(t)$:

$$\frac{1}{\beta}H = \sqrt{1+(d_n w)^2}H = w_t = -\langle \dot{\Gamma}(t), n\rangle d_n w = -\dot{\Gamma}_n(t)\frac{\beta_0}{\beta},$$

and we find the normal velocity of the moving boundary (independent of the parametrization of Γ_t):

$$\dot{\Gamma}_n = -\frac{1}{\beta_0}H_{|\Gamma(t)},$$

which in particular must hold at $t = 0$. Note that we don't get a 'compatibility condition' in the usual sense (of a constraint on the 2-jet of the initial data), but instead an equation of motion for the moving boundary. (Later, in the fixed-domain formulation, we will have to deal with a real compatibility condition).

Remark 2.1. We remark that for more general (non-symmetric, non-flat) triple junctions with 120 degree angles, the condition:

$$H^1 + H^2 = H^3 \text{ on } \Gamma(t)$$

must hold at the junction (for graphs, oriented by the upward normal), which in particular gives a geometric constraint on the initial data, for classical evolution in $C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}$. This is automatic in the symmetric case ($w^2 = -w^1, w^3 \equiv 0$), since $H^3 = 0$ and $H^I = tr_{g^I} d^2 w^I$ for $I = 1, 2$.

3. Choice of 'gauge'. It is traditional in moving boundary problems to parametrize the time-dependent domain $D(t)$ of the unknown $w(y,t)$ by a time-dependent diffeomorphism:

$$y = \varphi(x,t), \quad \varphi(t) : D_0 \to D(t),$$

and then derive the equation satisfied by the coordinate-changed function from the equation for w (see e.g. [9] or [14]). Motivated by the work on curve networks ([10]) we will, instead, consider a general parametrization:

$$F : D_0 \times [0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \quad F(x, t) = [\varphi(x, t), u(x, t)] \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$$

and derive an equation for F directly from the definition of mean curvature motion:

$$\langle \partial_t F, N \rangle = H.$$

(We'll still assume $\varphi(t) : D_0 \to D(t)$ is a diffeomorphism.) The first and second fundamental forms are given by:

$$g_{ij} = \langle F_i, F_j \rangle, \quad A(F_i, F_j) = \langle F_{ij}, N \rangle.$$

(Notation: $DF = F_i e_i, D^2 F(e_i, e_j) = F_{ij}$, (e_i) is the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.) The mean curvature is the trace of A in the induced metric:

$$H = \langle g^{ij}(DF) F_{ij}, N \rangle.$$

The equation for F is:

$$\langle \partial_t F - g^{ij}(DF) F_{ij}, N \rangle = 0.$$

There is a natural 'gauge choice' yielding a quasilinear parabolic system:

$$\partial_t F - g^{ij}(DF) F_{ij} = 0.$$

We will sometimes refer to this as the 'split gauge', since in terms of the components $F = [\varphi, u]$ we have the essentially decoupled system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - g^{ij}(D\varphi, Du) u_{ij} & = & 0, \\ \partial_t \varphi - g^{ij}(D\varphi, Du) \varphi_{ij} & = & 0. \end{cases}$$

The splitting is useful to state the boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} u_{|\partial D_0} = 0 \quad (\text{'contact'}), \\ N^{n+1}(D\varphi, Du)_{|\partial D_0} = \beta \quad (\text{'angle'}). \end{cases}$$

We immediately see there is a problem, since we have 2 scalar boundary conditions for $n + 1$ unknowns (and no moving boundary to help!) Our solution to this is to introduce $n - 1$ additional 'orthogonality conditions' at the boundary for the parametrization $\varphi(t)$. We impose:

$$\langle D_\tau \varphi, D_n \varphi \rangle_{|\partial D_0} = 0 \quad (\text{'orthogonality'}),$$

for any $\tau \in T\partial D_0$, where n denotes the inward unit normal to D_0. (We fix a tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of ∂D_0 and extend n to $\mathcal{N}$ so that $d_n n = 0$ in $\mathcal{N}$.)

Geometrically, the 'orthogonality' boundary condition has precedent in a method often adopted when dealing with the evolution of hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ intersecting a fixed n-dimensional 'support surface' orthogonally (see e.g. [15]): one replaces vanishing inner product of the unit normals (a single scalar condition) by a stronger Neumann-type condition for the parametrization, corresponding to $n-1$ scalar conditions. (More details are given in Section 10.)

The system must also be supplied with initial data. We assume given an initial hypersurface Σ_0, the graph of a $C^{3+\bar{\alpha}}$ function $\tilde{u}_0(x)$ defined in the $C^{3+\bar{\alpha}}$ domain $D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. (The reason for this choice of differentiability class will be seen later.) It would seem natural to set $\varphi_0 = Id_{D_0}$, but this causes problems (related to compatibility; see Section 4 below). We do require the 1-jet of φ_0 at the boundary to be that of the identity:

$$\varphi_{0|\partial D_0} = Id, \quad D\varphi_{0|\partial D} = \mathbb{I}.$$

(In particular, the orthogonality condition holds at $t = 0$.)

We need a more explicit expression for the unit normal, and for that we use the 'vector product':

$$\tilde{N}(D\varphi, Du) := (-1)^n \det \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & \cdots & e_{n+1} \\ DF^1 & \cdots & DF^{n+1} \end{bmatrix} = (-1)^n \det \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & \ldots & e_n & e_{n+1} \\ D\varphi^1 & \ldots & D\varphi^n & Du \end{bmatrix}$$

$$:= [J(D\varphi, Du), J_\varphi] \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R},$$

where $DF^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $i = 1, \ldots n+1$, $J_\varphi > 0$ is the jacobian of φ and $(-1)^n$ is introduced to make sure the last component is positive. $J(D\varphi, Du)$ is an $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued multilinear form, linear in the components u_i of Du and of weight $n-1$ in the components of $D\varphi$. It is easy to check that $J(\mathbb{I}, Du) = -Du$. The unit normal is:

$$N(D\varphi, Du) = \tilde{N}(D\varphi, Du)/(|J(D\varphi, Du)|^2 + (J_\varphi)^2)^{1/2}.$$

Thus the angle condition may be stated in the form:

$$\beta[|J(Du, D\varphi)|^2 + (J_\varphi)^2]^{1/2}_{|\partial D_0} = J_{\varphi|\partial D_0},$$

and we lose nothing by squaring it:

$$B(D\varphi, Du) := \beta^2 |J(Du, D\varphi)|^2 - \beta_0^2 (J_\varphi)^2_{|\partial D_0} = 0.$$

4. Compatibility and the choice of φ_0. Assume $D\varphi_{0|\partial D_0} = \mathbb{I}$. Differentiating in t the contact condition $u_{|\partial D_0} = 0$ and evaluating at $t = 0$, we find:

$$0 = g^{ij}(\mathbb{I}, Du_0)u_{0ij} \equiv g_0^{ij}u_{0ij} \text{ on } \partial D_0.$$

To interpret this condition, consider the mean curvature at $t = 0$, on ∂D_0:

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{v_0}[\langle J(\mathbb{I}, Du_0), g_0^{ij}\varphi_{0ij}\rangle + J_{\varphi_0}g_0^{ij}u_{0ij}],$$

where:

$$v_0 = [|J(\mathbb{I}, Du_0)|^2 + J^2_{\varphi_0}]^{1/2}_{|\partial D_0} = (|Du_0|^2 + 1)^{1/2}_{|\partial D_0} = \frac{1}{\beta},$$

using (recall $\beta_0 := \sqrt{1-\beta^2}$):

$$J(\mathbb{I}, Du_0) = -Du_0 = -(D_n u_0)n = -\frac{\beta_0}{\beta}n$$

on ∂D_0. Thus the compatibility condition is equivalent to:

$$H_{0|\partial D_0} = -\beta_0 g_0^{ij}\langle\varphi_{0ij}, n\rangle_{|\partial D_0}.$$

This implies we can't choose $\varphi_0 \equiv Id$ (on all of D_0), unless $H_{0|\partial D_0} \equiv 0$, a constraint not present in the geometric problem (as seen above).[1] Instead, regarding H_0 as given (by Σ_0), and using:

$$g_0^{ij} = \delta_{ij} - \frac{u_{0i}u_{0j}}{v_0^2} = \delta_{ij} - \beta_0^2 n^i n^j,$$

we find the compatibility constraint:

$$\langle(\delta_{ij} - \beta_0^2 n^i n^j)\varphi_{0ij}, n\rangle = -\frac{1}{\beta_0}H_0 \text{ on } \partial D_0.$$

Given the zero and first order constraints on φ_0, this can also be written as:

$$n^i n^j\langle\varphi_{0ij}, n\rangle = -\frac{1}{\beta^2\beta_0}H_0 \text{ on } \partial D_0.$$

The next lemma shows this can be solved.

---

[1] The compatibility condition $H_{0|\partial D_0} = 0$ does occur for graph m.c.m. with Dirichlet boundary conditions in a mean-convex domain [6].

Lemma 4.1. Let $D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a uniformly $C^{3+\alpha}$ domain (possibly unbounded), $h \in C^\alpha(\partial D_0)$ $(0 < \alpha < 1)$.

(i) One may find a diffeomorphism $\varphi \in Diff^{2+\alpha}(D_0)$ satisfying on ∂D_0:

$$\varphi = Id, \quad d\varphi = \mathbb{I}, \quad n \cdot d^2\varphi(n,n) = h.$$

(ii) More generally, given a non-vanishing vector field $e \in C^{1+\alpha}(\partial D_0; \mathbb{R}^n)$, one may find $\varphi \in Diff^{2+\alpha}(D_0)$ satisfying on ∂D_0:

$$\varphi = Id, \quad d_n\varphi = e, \quad n \cdot d^2\varphi(n,n) = h.$$

If ∂D_0 has two components, we may even require φ to satisfy the conditions in parts (i) and (ii) at $\partial_1 D_0$, $\partial_2 D_0$ (resp.), with different functions h. (This will be needed in section 10).

As usual, a domain is 'uniformly $C^{3+\alpha}$' if at each boundary point there are local charts to the upper half-space (of class $C^{3+\alpha}$), defined on balls of uniform radius, and with uniform bounds on the $C^{3+\alpha}$ norms of the charts and their inverses.

Remarks: 4.1.The proof is given in Appendix 1.

4.2. Note that, in particular, φ satisfies the orthogonality conditions at ∂D_0.

4.3. It is at this step in the proof that we have a drop in regularity: for $C^{2+\alpha}$ local solutions, we require $C^{3+\alpha}$ initial data. While this is not unexpected in free-boundary problems (see e.g. [9]), I don't know a counterexample to the lemma if D_0 is assumed to be a $C^{2+\alpha}$ domain.

4.4. In our application of the lemma, we in fact have $h \in C^{1+\alpha}(\partial D_0)$, but this does not imply higher regularity for φ.

5. Linearization. The evolution equation and boundary conditions in 'split gauge' are:

$$\begin{cases} F_t - g^{ij}(DF)F_{ij} &= 0, \\ u_{|\partial D_0} &= 0, \\ B(D\varphi, Du)_{|\partial D_0} &= 0, \\ \mathcal{O}(D\varphi)_{|\partial D_0} &= 0, \end{cases}$$

where:

$$\mathcal{O}(D\varphi) := \langle D^T\varphi, D_n\varphi\rangle.$$

Here $D^T\varphi = D\varphi - (d_n\varphi)\langle\cdot, n\rangle$ is an $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued $(n-1)$-form on ∂D_0. We'll prove short-time existence for this system (with initial data u_0, φ_0) in $C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}$ by the usual fixed-point argument based on linear parabolic theory. Given

$\bar{F} = [\bar{\varphi}, \bar{u}]$ in a suitable ball in this Hölder space with center $F_0 = [\varphi_0, u_0]$, it suffices to consider the ‘pseudolinearization’ of the system:

$$F_t - g^{ij}(DF_0)F_{ij} = [g^{ij}(D\bar{F}) - g^{ij}(DF_0)]\bar{F}_{ij} := \mathcal{F}(\bar{F}, F_0) := \bar{\mathcal{F}} \quad (LPDE);$$

a fixed point of the map $\bar{F} \mapsto F$ corresponds to a solution of the quasilinear equation.

For the nonlinear boundary conditions, we need the honest linearization at F_0. For the angle condition, a computation using the boundary constraints on u_0 and φ_0 yields:

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_0 B[D\varphi, Du] = -\beta\beta_0 d_n u - \beta_0^2 \langle d_n\varphi, n\rangle.$$

The corresponding linear boundary condition will be:

$$\beta\beta_0 d_n u + \beta_0^2\langle d_n\varphi, n\rangle = \mathcal{B}(D\bar{F}, DF_0) := \bar{\mathcal{B}},$$

where:

$$2\mathcal{B}(DF^1, DF^2) := B(D\varphi_1, Du_1) - B(D\varphi_2, Du_2) - \mathcal{L}_0 B[D(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2), D(u_1 - u_2)],$$

and we used:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_0[D\varphi_0, Du_0]_{|\partial D_0} = \beta\beta_0 d_n u_0 + \beta_0^2\langle d_n\varphi_0, n\rangle_{|\partial D_0} = 0.$$

Also, $B(D\varphi_0, Du_0)_{|\partial D_0} = 0$, so at a fixed point $B(D\varphi, Du)_{|\partial D_0} = 0$.

Linearizing the orthogonality boundary condition, we find that $\mathcal{L}_0\mathcal{O}[D\varphi]$ is the $(n-1)$-form on ∂D_0:

$$\mathcal{L}_0\mathcal{O}[D\varphi](v) = (\partial_j\varphi^i + \partial_i\varphi^j)n^j(\delta_{ik} - n^k n^i)v^k$$

(with sum over repeated indices.) The corresponding linear boundary condition is:

$$\langle d_n\varphi, proj^T\rangle + \langle D^T\varphi, n\rangle = -\Omega(D\bar{\varphi}, D\varphi_0) := \bar{\Omega},$$

where $proj^T$ denotes orthogonal projection $\mathbb{R}^n \to T\partial D_0$, and:

$$\Omega(D\varphi_1, D\varphi_2) := \mathcal{O}(D\varphi_1) - \mathcal{O}(D\varphi_2) - \mathcal{L}_0\mathcal{O}[D\varphi_1 - D\varphi_2],$$

and we used:

$$\mathcal{L}_0\mathcal{O}[D\varphi_0]_{|\partial D_0} = \langle (d_n\varphi_0)^T, \cdot\rangle + \langle D^T\varphi_0, n\rangle_{|\partial D_0} = 0.$$

6. Complementarity. We wish to apply linear existence theory to the system:

$$F_t - g^{ij}(DF_0)F_{ij} = \bar{\mathcal{F}},$$

with boundary conditions at ∂D_0:

$$(LBC)\begin{cases} u = 0 \\ \beta\beta_0 d_n u + \beta_0^2\langle d_n\varphi, n\rangle = \bar{\mathcal{B}}, \\ \langle d_n\varphi, proj^T\rangle + \langle D^T\varphi, n\rangle = -\bar{\Omega} \end{cases}$$

and initial conditions:

$$u_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \varphi_{t=0} = \varphi_0.$$

It is easy to see that the initial data satisfy the linearized boundary conditions, and above we constructed φ_0 so as to guarantee $g^{ij}(Du_0, D\varphi_0)u_{0ij|\partial D_0} = 0$. (There is no first-order compatibility condition for φ_0.) Thus the linear system satisfies the required compatibility at $t = 0$.

Since the linearized boundary conditions are slightly non-standard, we must verify they satisfy the 'complementarity' (Lopatinski-Shapiro) conditions. We *fix* $x_0 \in \partial D_0$ and introduce adapted coordinates (ρ, σ) in a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_0 \subset \mathcal{N}$ of x_0 in D_0:

$$x \in \mathcal{N}_0 \Rightarrow x = \Gamma_0(\sigma) + \rho n(\sigma), \quad \sigma = (\sigma_a) \in \mathcal{U},$$

where $\Gamma_0 : \mathcal{U} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a local chart for ∂D_0 at x_0 ($\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ open). This defines a basis of tangential vector fields in $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{U})$, and we may assume that, at x_0: $\langle \tau_a, \tau_b\rangle = \delta_{ab}$ and $\nabla_{\tau_a}\tau_b(x_0) = 0$ (for the induced connection on $T\partial D_0$). Let U and ψ be defined in $(-\rho_1, 0) \times \mathcal{U} \times [0, T]$ by:

$$U(\rho, \sigma, t) = u(\Gamma_0(\sigma) + \rho n(\sigma), t), \quad \psi(\rho, \sigma, t) = \varphi(\Gamma_0(\sigma) + \rho n(\sigma), t).$$

In these coordinates, the induced metric is written (in 'block form'):

$$[g(DF_0)] = \begin{bmatrix} |\psi_\rho|^2 + (U_\rho)^2 & \langle\psi_\rho, \psi_a\rangle + U_\rho U_a \\ \langle\psi_\rho, \psi_a\rangle + U_\rho U_a & \langle\psi_a, \psi_b\rangle + U_a U_b \end{bmatrix}_{|t=0} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\beta^2} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{I}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

at $t = 0$ and x_0.

We have:

$$U_{\rho\rho} = D^2u(n, n) \text{ (since } d_n n = 0),$$

$$U_{ab} = D^2u(\tau_a, \tau_b) + Du \cdot \nabla_{\tau_a}\tau_b = D^2u(\tau_a, \tau_b) \text{ at } x_0,$$

and we don't need $U_{\rho a}$, since $g_{\rho a} = 0$ at x_0.

Thus:

$$tr_{g_0} D^2u(x_0) = \beta^2 D^2u(n,n) + \sum_a D^2u(\tau_a, \tau_a) = \beta^2 U_{\rho\rho} + \sum_a U_{aa} := \beta^2 U_{\rho\rho} + \Delta_\sigma U,$$

and, likewise:

$$tr_{g_0} D^2\varphi(x_0) = \beta^2 \psi_{\rho\rho} + \Delta_\sigma \psi.$$

For the linearized orthogonality operator, note that, at x_0:

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \mathcal{O}[D\psi] = (\langle \psi_\rho, \tau_a \rangle + \psi_a, n\rangle)\tau_a.$$

Putting everything together, the linear system to consider at x_0 is:

$$\begin{cases} U_t - \beta^2 U_{\rho\rho} - \Delta_\sigma U = 0, \\ \psi_t - \beta^2 \psi_{\rho\rho} - \Delta_\sigma \psi = 0, \end{cases}$$

with boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} U|_{\rho=0} = 0, \\ \beta_0 \langle \psi_\rho, n\rangle + \beta U_\rho|_{\rho=0} = b(\sigma, t), \\ \langle \psi_\rho, \tau_a\rangle + \langle \psi_a, n\rangle|_{\rho=0} = \omega_a(\sigma, t), \quad a = 1, \dots n-1. \end{cases}$$

Now take Fourier transform in $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ (corresponding to $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$), Laplace transform in t (corresponding to $p \in \mathbb{C}$) to obtain:

$$\hat{U}(\rho, \xi, p) \in \mathbb{C}, \hat{\psi}(\rho, \xi, p) \in \mathbb{C}^n; \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, p \in \mathbb{C}, \rho < 0.$$

In transformed variables, we obtain the system of linear ODE (in $\rho < 0$, for fixed (ξ, p)):

$$\begin{cases} \beta^2 \hat{U}_{\rho\rho} - (p + |\xi|^2)\hat{U} = 0, \\ \beta^2 \hat{\psi}_{\rho\rho} - (p + |\xi|^2)\hat{\psi} = 0 \end{cases}$$

Writing the solution in the form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{U}(\rho) \\ \hat{\psi}(\rho) \end{bmatrix} = e^{i\rho\gamma} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{U}(0) \\ \hat{\psi}(0) \end{bmatrix},$$

we find the characteristic equation $\beta^2\gamma^2 + p + |\xi|^2 = 0$, and choose the root γ so that $i\gamma = (1/\beta)\sqrt{\Delta}$ (where $\Delta = p + |\xi|^2$ and we take the branch of $\sqrt{\cdot}$: $Re(\sqrt{\Delta}) > 0$). Here $(p, \xi) \in \mathcal{A}$, where:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(p, \xi) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}; |p| + |\xi| > 0, Re(p) > -|\xi|^2\}.$$

Thus the solutions decay as $\rho \to -\infty$. Let $\mathcal{W}^+$ be the space of such decaying solutions, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{W}^+ = n-1$. The relevant boundary operator on $\mathcal{W}^+$ is:

$$\mathbb{B}\begin{bmatrix} \hat{U} \\ \hat{\psi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{U} \\ \beta_0 \langle \hat{\psi}_\rho, n\rangle + \beta \hat{U}_\rho \\ \langle \hat{\psi}_\rho, \tau_a\rangle + i\xi_a \langle \hat{\Psi}, n\rangle \end{bmatrix}_{|\rho=0} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{U}(0) \\ \beta_0 (i\gamma)\langle \hat{\psi}(0), n\rangle + i\beta\gamma \hat{U}(0) \\ (i\gamma)\langle \hat{\psi}(0), \tau_a\rangle + i\xi_a \langle \hat{\psi}(0), n\rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

(a vector in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$).

The 'complementarity condition' (see e.g. [3]) is the statement that $\mathbb{B}$ is a linear isomorphism from $\mathcal{W}^+$ to $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. With respect to the basis $\{\hat{U}(0), \langle \hat{\psi}(0), n\rangle, \langle \hat{\psi}(0), \tau_a\rangle\}$ of $\mathcal{W}^+$, the matrix of $\mathbb{B}$ is (in 'block form'):

$$[\mathbb{B}] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & [0]_{1\times(n-1)} \\ -\sqrt{\Delta} & -\frac{\beta_0}{\beta}\sqrt{\Delta} & [0]_{1\times(n-1)} \\ [0]_{(n-1)\times 1} & [i\xi_a]_{(n-1)\times 1} & -\frac{\sqrt{\Delta}}{\beta}\mathbb{I}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This is triangular with non-zero diagonal entries for every $(p, \xi) \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence $\mathbb{B}$ is an isomorphism.

7. Estimates in Hölder spaces.

For the fixed-point argument based on the linear system, we need estimates for $||\mathcal{F}||_\alpha$, $||\mathcal{B}||_{1+\alpha}$, $||\Omega||_{1+\alpha}$, of two types: 'mapping' and 'contraction' estimates.

A bit more precisely, for $T > 0$, $R > 0$ and $Q^T = D_0 \times [0, T]$ consider the open ball:

$$B_R^T = \{F \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\alpha/2}(Q^T, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}); ||F - F_0||_{2+\alpha} < R, F|_{t=0} = F_0\}.$$

($F_0 = [\varphi_0, u_0]$ is defined from the initial surface Σ_0, via Lemma 4.1.) Solving the linear system with 'right-hand side' defined by $\bar{F} \in B_R^T$ defines a map $\mathbb{F} : \bar{F} \mapsto F$, and we need to verify that, for suitable choices of T and R, $\mathbb{F}$ maps into B_R^T and is a contraction.

Remark: The argument that follows is standard, and the experienced reader may want to skip to the statement of local existence at the end of the next section. On the other hand, the result is not covered by any general theorem proved in detail in a reference known to the author, and some readers may find it useful to have all the details included. Another reason is that, although the 'right hand sides' are clearly quadratic, without explicit expressions one might run into trouble with compositions (which behave poorly in Hölder spaces), or when appealing to 'Taylor remainder arguments' if the domain is not convex.

For 'mapping', we need estimates of the form:

$$||\mathcal{F}(\bar{F}, F_0)||_\alpha + ||\mathcal{B}(D\bar{F}, DF_0)||_{1+\alpha} + ||\Omega(D\bar{\varphi}, D\varphi_0)||_{1+\alpha} \text{ decays as } T \to 0_+,$$

and for 'contraction':

$$||\mathcal{F}(F^1, F^0) - \mathcal{F}(F^2, F^0)||_\alpha + ||\mathcal{B}(DF^1, DF^2)||_{1+\alpha} + ||\Omega(D\varphi^1, D\varphi^2)||_{1+\alpha} \leq \mu(T)||F^1 - F^2||_{2+\alpha},$$

where $\mu(T) \to 0$ as $T \to 0_+$.

Notation: The $(\alpha, \alpha/2)$ norms are taken on Q^T, the $(1+\alpha, (1+\alpha)/2)$ norms on $\partial D_0 \times [0, T])$. Double bars without an index refer to the $(2+\alpha, 1+\alpha/2)$ norm, single bars to supremum norms over Q^T, and parabolic norms are indexed by their spatial regularity (α for $(\alpha, \alpha/2)$, etc.) In general, we use brackets for Hölder-type difference quotients.

We deal with the estimates for the 'forcing term' $\mathcal{F}$ first. Consider the map

$$\mathcal{G} : Imm(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) \to GL_n$$

which associates to the linear immersion A the inverse matrix of $(\langle A_i, A_j \rangle)_{i=1}^n$, inner products of the rows of A. $\mathcal{G}$ is smooth, in particular locally Lipschitz in the space $\mathcal{W}$ of linear immersions. Hence if F^1, F^2 are maps $Q^T \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, such that $DF^i \in C^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q^T)$ and $DF^i(z) \in K$ for all $z \in Q^T$, where $K \subset \mathcal{W}$ is a fixed compact set, we have the bound:

$$||\mathcal{G}(DF^1) - \mathcal{G}(DF^2)||_\alpha \leq c_K ||D(F^1 - F^2)||_\alpha.$$

In fact our maps F^i are in $C^{2+\alpha, 1+\alpha/2}$, so $DF^i \in C^{1+\alpha, \frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$. From this higher regularity we obtain the decay as $T \to 0_+$. Assuming $F^1|_{t=0} = F^2|_{t=0}$, we have:

$$|D(F^1 - F^2)| \leq [D(F^1 - F^2)]_t^{(\frac{1+\alpha}{2})} T^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}.$$

Now recall the elementary fact: if $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a uniformly C^1 domain (not necessarily convex or bounded), and $f \in C^1(D)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have: $[f]^{(\alpha)} \leq C_D ||f||_{C^1}$. (Here 'uniformly C^1' means D can be covered by countably many balls of a fixed radius, which are domains of C^1 manifold-with-boundary local charts for D, with uniform C^1 bounds for the charts and their inverses. The constant C_D depends on those bounds.) Applying this to DF, where $F = F^1 - F^2$ vanishes identically at $t = 0$, and assuming $T < 1$:

$$[DF]_x^{(a)} \leq c(|DF|+|D^2F|) \leq c([DF]_t^{(\frac{1+\alpha}{2})}T^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}+[D^2F]_t^{(\frac{\alpha}{2})}T^{\alpha/2}) \leq c||F||T^{\alpha/2},$$

(where c depends on D_0) and similarly for the oscillation in t:

$$[DF]_t^{(\frac{\alpha}{2})} \leq [DF]_t^{(\frac{1+\alpha}{2})}T^{1/2} \leq ||F||T^{1/2},$$

so we have:

$$||D(F^1 - F^2)||_\alpha \leq c||F^1 - F^2||T^{\alpha/2}.$$

We conclude, under the assumption $F^1 = F^2$ at $t = 0$:

$$||\mathcal{G}(DF^1) - \mathcal{G}(DF^2)||_\alpha \leq c_K||F^1 - F^2||T^{\alpha/2}.$$

In particular, applying this to $\bar{F}$ and F_0, we find:

$$||(\mathcal{G}(D\bar{F}) - \mathcal{G}(DF_0))D^2\bar{F}||_\alpha \leq c_K||\bar{F} - F_0||T^{\alpha/2}||\bar{F}||,$$

and for F^1 and F^2 coinciding at $t = 0$:

$$||(\mathcal{G}(DF^1) - \mathcal{G}(DF^2))D^2F^1||_\alpha \leq c_K||F^1 - F^2||T^{\alpha/2}||F^1||,$$

as well as:

$$||(\mathcal{G}(DF^2) - \mathcal{G}(DF_0))(D^2F^1 - D^2F^2)||_\alpha \leq c_K||F^2 - F_0||T^{\alpha/2}||F^1 - F^2||,$$

so we have the mapping and contraction estimates for $\mathcal{F}(\bar{F}, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{F}(F^1, F_0) - \mathcal{F}(F^2, F_0)$.

Lemma 7.1. Assume $\bar{F}, F_0, F^1, F^2$ are in $C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}(Q^T;\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ and have the same initial values, and that $D\bar{F}, DF_0, DF^1, DF^2$ all take values in the compact subset K of $Imm(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. Then:

$$||\mathcal{F}(\bar{F}, F_0)||_\alpha \leq c_K||\bar{F} - F_0||||\bar{F}||T^{\alpha/2},$$

$$||\mathcal{F}(F^1, F_0) - \mathcal{F}(F^2, F_0)||_\alpha \leq c_K(||F^1|| + ||F^2 - F_0||)T^{\alpha/2}||F^1 - F^2||.$$

In particular, if $\bar{F} \in B_R^T$:

$$||\mathcal{F}(\bar{F}, F_0)||_\alpha \leq c_0RT^{\alpha/2}.$$

If $\bar{F}^1, \bar{F}^2 \in B_R^T$, we have:

$$||\mathcal{F}(\bar{F}^1, F_0) - \mathcal{F}(\bar{F}^2, F_0)||_\alpha \leq c_0T^{\alpha/2}||\bar{F}^1 - \bar{F}^2||.$$

(The constant c_0 depends only on the data at $t = 0$, and we assume $T < 1$, $R < 1$).

Turning to the orthogonality boundary condition, first observe that:

$$\Omega(D\varphi^1, D\varphi^2) = \langle D^T\varphi^1, d_n\varphi^1\rangle - \langle D^T\varphi^2, d_n\varphi^2\rangle - \mathcal{L}_0\mathcal{O}[D\varphi^1 - D\varphi^2]$$

$$= \langle D^T(\varphi^1-\varphi^2), d_n\varphi^1\rangle + \langle D^T\varphi^2, d_n(\varphi^1-\varphi^2)\rangle - \langle d_n(\varphi^1-\varphi^2), D^T\varphi_0\rangle - \langle D^T(\varphi^1-\varphi^2), d_n\varphi_0\rangle$$

$$= \langle D^T\varphi^1 - D^T\varphi^2, d_n\varphi^1 - d_n\varphi_0\rangle + \langle d_n\varphi^1 - d_n\varphi^2, D^T\varphi^2 - D^T\varphi_0\rangle,$$

which has quadratic structure. Using a local frame $(\tau_a)_{a=1}^{n-1}$ for $T\partial D_0$, we find the components Ω_a:

$$\Omega_a(D\varphi^1, D\varphi^2) = [\partial_i(\varphi^1 - \varphi^2)\partial_j(\varphi^1 - \varphi_0) + \partial_j(\varphi^1 - \varphi^2)\partial_i(\varphi^2 - \varphi_0)]n^j\tau_a^i$$

(summation convention, $i, j = 1, \dots n$), so Ω_a is a sum of terms of the form: $b(x)D(\varphi^1 - \varphi^2)D(\varphi^3 - \varphi^4)$, where $b(x) = n^j\tau_a^i$ and the φ^I coincide at $t = 0$. It is then not hard to show that:

$$||b(x)D(\varphi^1 - \varphi^2)D(\varphi^3 - \varphi^4)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c||b||_{1+\alpha}||\varphi^1 - \varphi^2||||\varphi^3 - \varphi^4||T^\alpha,$$

with c depending on the C^1 norms of local charts for D_0. To bound the norm $||n\otimes\tau_a||_{1+\alpha}$, note $|n||\tau_a| \leq 1$, $|D(n\otimes\tau_a)| \leq |Dn| + |D\tau_a|$ and $[D(n\otimes\tau_a)]_x^{(\alpha)} \leq [Dn]_x^{(\alpha)} + [D\tau_a]_x^\alpha$. Since $n = -(\beta/\beta_0)Du_0$ on ∂D_0 (and ∂D_0 is a level set of u_0), we clearly have:

$$||Dn||_\alpha + ||D\tau_a||_\alpha \leq c||D^2u_0||_\alpha \leq c||u_0||.$$

We summarize the conclusion in the following lemma.

Lemma 7.2. Assume $\bar{\varphi}, \varphi_0, \varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}(Q^T; \mathbb{R}^n)$ have the same initial values. Then:

$$||\Omega(D\bar{\varphi}, D\varphi_0)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c_0||u_0||||\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_0||^2T^\alpha$$

and

$$||\Omega(D\varphi^1, D\varphi^2)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c_0||u_0||(||\varphi^1 - \varphi_0|| + ||\varphi^2 - \varphi_0||)T^\alpha||\varphi^1 - \varphi^2||,$$

with c_0 depending only on the data at $t = 0$. In particular, if $\bar{F} = [\bar{\varphi}, \bar{u}] \in B_R^T$, we have:

$$||\Omega(D\bar{\varphi}, D\varphi_0)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c_0R^2T^\alpha,$$

and for $\bar{F}^I = [\bar{\varphi}^I, \bar{u}^I] \in B_R^T$, $I = 1, 2$:

$$||\Omega(D\bar{\varphi}^1, D\bar{\varphi}^2)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c_0RT^\alpha||\bar{\varphi}^1 - \bar{\varphi}^2||.$$

To explain the estimates for the angle condition, we write the normal vector as a multilinear form on DF^i:

$$\tilde{N}(DF) = J_n(DF) := (-1)^n \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (-1)^{i-1} (DF^1 \wedge \ldots \hat{DF^i} \wedge \ldots DF^{n+1}) e_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

(DF^i omitted in the $i^{th\cdot}$ term of the sum), where $DF^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n+1$ and we identify the n-multivector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a scalar, using the standard volume form. The angle condition has the form:

$$\beta^2 |\tilde{N}|^2 - \langle \tilde{N}, e_{n+1} \rangle^2 = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_0,$$

and we set:

$$B(DF) := \beta^2 |J_n(DF)|^2 - \langle J_n(DF), e_{n+1} \rangle^2,$$

with linearization at $DF_0 = [\mathbb{I}_n | Du_0]$:

$$\mathcal{L}_0 B[DF] = 2\beta^2 \langle J_n(DF_0), DJ_n(DF_0)[DF] \rangle - 2 \langle J_n(DF_0), e_{n+1} \rangle \langle DJ_n(DF_0)[DF], e_{n+1} \rangle.$$

Under the assumption $F^1 = F^2$ at $t = 0$, we need an estimate in $C^{1+\alpha, \frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ for:

$$\mathcal{B}(DF^1, DF^2) := B(DF^1) - B(DF^2) - \mathcal{L}_0 B[DF^1 - DF^2]$$

$$= \beta^2 (|J_n(DF^1)|^2 - |J_n(DF^2)|^2 - 2\langle J_n(DF_0), DJ_n(DF_0)[DF^1 - DF^2] \rangle)$$

$$-(\langle J_n(DF^1), e_{n+1} \rangle^2 - \langle J_n(DF^2), e_{n+1} \rangle^2 - 2 \langle J_n(DF_0), e_{n+1} \rangle \langle DJ_n(DF_0)[DF^1 - DF^2], e_{n+1} \rangle).$$

It will suffice to estimate the expression in the first parenthesis; the second is analogous.

We need the following algebraic observation: if $T_0 = [\mathbb{I}_n | Du_0]$ and T are $n \times (n+1)$ matrices, the expression:

$$|J_n(T_0 + T)|^2 - |J_n(T_0)|^2 - 2 \langle J_n(T_0), DJ_n(T_0)[T] \rangle$$

is a linear combination (with constant coefficients) of terms of the form:

$$u_{0i} p_{(2)}(T), \quad u_{0i} u_{0j} p_{(2)}(T), \quad p_{(2)}(T),$$

where the $p_{(2)}(T)$ are polynomials in the entries of T (with constant coefficients), with terms of degree: $2 \leq deg \leq 2n$.

Thus $\mathcal{B}(DF^1, DF^2)$ is a linear combination (with constant coefficients) of terms:

$$u_{0i}p_{(2)}(DF^1 - DF^2), \quad u_{0i}u_{0j}p_{(2)}(DF^1 - DF^2), \quad p_{(2)}(DF^1 - DF^2),$$

with the $p_{(2)}$ as described; and hence is a linear combination of terms of the form:

$$u_{0i}(F^{1j}_k - F^{2j}_k)^d, \quad u_{0i}u_{0l}(F^{1j}_k - F^{2j}_k)^d, \quad (F^{1j}_k - F^{2j}_k)^d$$

(where $2 \leq d \leq 2n, 1 \leq j \leq n+1, 1 \leq i, l, k \leq n$), which we write symbolically as:

$$\mathcal{B}(DF^1, DF^2) \sim \sum_{2 \leq d \leq 2n} b(x)(DF^1 - DF^2)^d,$$

where $b(x)$ is constant or $u_{0i}(x)$ or $u_{0i}(x)u_{0j}(x)$. For the degree d terms $G^{(d)} \sim b(x)(DF^1 - DF^2)^d$, it is not hard to show the bound:

$$||G^{(d)}||_{1+\alpha} \leq c||b||_{1+\alpha}||F^1 - F^2||^d T^\alpha, \quad 2 \leq d \leq 2n.$$

We conclude:

Lemma 7.3. Assume $\bar{F}, F_0, F^1, F^2$ are in $C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}(Q^T; \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ and have the same initial values. Then:

$$||\mathcal{B}(D\bar{F}, DF_0)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c(1 + ||u_0||^2)(1 + ||\bar{F} - F_0||^{2n-2})T^\alpha ||\bar{F} - F_0||^2.$$

$$||\mathcal{B}(DF^1, DF^2)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c(1 + ||u_0||^2)(1 + ||F^1 - F^2||^{2n-2})T^\alpha ||F^1 - F^2||^2,$$

with c depending only on F_0. In particular, if $\bar{F} \in B^T_R$:

$$||\mathcal{B}(D\bar{F}, DF_0)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c_0 R^2 T^\alpha,$$

and if $\bar{F}^1, \bar{F}^2 \in B^T_R$:

$$||\mathcal{B}(D\bar{F}^1, D\bar{F}^2)||_{1+\alpha} \leq c_0 T^\alpha ||\bar{F}^1 - \bar{F}^2||,$$

with c_0 depending only on F_0.

8. Local existence.

Given a $C^{3+\bar{\alpha}}$ graph Σ_0 over a uniformly $C^{3+\bar{\alpha}}$ domain $D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (for arbitrary $\bar{\alpha} \in (0,1)$) satisfying the contact and angle conditions, let $\varphi_0 \in Diff^{2+\bar{\alpha}}$ be the diffeomorphism given by lemma 4.1 (with the 1-jet of the identity at ∂D_0 and 2-jet determined by the mean curvature of Σ_0 at ∂D_0). Then find $u_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(D_0)$ so that $F_0 = [\varphi_0, u_0] \in C^{2+\alpha}(D_0; \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ parametrizes Σ_0 over D_0 ($\alpha = \bar{\alpha}^2 < \bar{\alpha}$).

(Precisely, if $[z, \tilde{u_0}(z)]$ parametrizes Σ_0 as a graph, and φ_0 is given by lemma 4.1, let $u_0 = \tilde{u_0} \circ \varphi_0$; so $u_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}$.)

We obtained in section 7 all the estimates needed for a fixed-point argument in the set:

$$B_R^T = \{F \in C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}(Q^T, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}); ||F - F_0|| < R, F|_{t=0} = F_0\}.$$

Choose $R < 1$ and $T_0 < 1$ small enough (depending only on F_0) so that, for $F \in B_R^{T_0}$, $F(t) = [\varphi(t), u(t)]$ defines an embedding of D_0, with $\varphi(t)$ a diffeomorphism onto its image $D(t)$. Let $K \subset Imm(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ be a compact set containing $DF(z)$ for all $F \in B_R, z \in Q^{T_0}$. Now consider $T < T_0$.

Given $\bar{F} \in B_R^T$, solve the linear system (LPDE/LBC) (with initial data F_0) to obtain $F \in C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}(Q^T)$. (This is possible since the complementarity and compatibility conditions hold for the linear system.) This defines a map $\mathbb{F} : \bar{F} \mapsto F$.

From linear parabolic theory (e.g. [3], thm VI.21]):

$$||F - F_0|| \leq M(||\mathcal{F}(\bar{F}, F_0)||_\alpha + ||\mathcal{B}(D\bar{F}, DF_0)||_{1+\alpha} + ||\Omega(D\bar{\varphi}, D\varphi_0)||_{1+\alpha}),$$

where $M > 0$ depends on the $C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ norm of the coefficients of the linear system, that is, ultimately on $||F_0||$.

From lemmas 7.2-7.4 in section 7, it follows that:

$$||F - F_0|| \leq Mc_0(RT^{\alpha/2} + R^2T^\alpha) < R$$

provided T is chosen small enough (depending only on F_0.) Thus $\mathbb{F}$ maps B_R^T to itself.

Similarly, if $\mathbb{F}(\bar{F}^i) = F^i$ for $i = 1, 2$, standard estimates for the linear system solved by $F^1 - F^2$ give:

$$||F^1 - F^2|| \leq M(||\mathcal{F}(\bar{F}^1, \bar{F}^2)||_\alpha + ||\mathcal{B}(D\bar{F}^1, D\bar{F}^2)||_{1+\alpha} + ||\Omega(D\bar{\varphi}^1, D\bar{\varphi}^2)||_{1+\alpha})$$

Again the estimates in lemmas 7.2-7.4 imply:

$$||F^1 - F^2|| \leq Mc_0(T^{\alpha/2} + T^\alpha)||\bar{F}^1 - \bar{F}^2|| < \frac{1}{2}||\bar{F}^1 - \bar{F}^2||,$$

assuming T is small enough (depending only on F_0). This concludes the argument for local existence.

Theorem 8.1. Let $\Sigma_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a $C^{3+\bar{\alpha}}$ graph over $D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the contact and angle conditions at ∂D_0. With $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}^2$, there exists a parametrization $F_0 = [\varphi_0, u_0] \in C^{2+\alpha}(D_0)$ of Σ_0, a number $T > 0$ depending only on F_0 and a unique solution $F \in C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}(Q^T; \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ of the system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t F - g^{ij}(DF)\partial_i\partial_j F = 0, \quad F = [\varphi, u] \\ u_{|\partial D_0} = 0, \quad N^{n+1}(D\varphi, Du)_{|\partial D_0} = \beta, \quad \langle D^T\varphi, d_n\varphi\rangle_{|\partial D_0} = 0 \end{cases}$$

with initial data F_0. For each $t \in [0, T]$, $F(t)$ is a $C^{2+\alpha}$ embedding parametrizing a surface Σ_t which satisfies the contact and angle conditions and moves by mean curvature. In addition, $F(t)$ satisfies the orthogonality condition at ∂D_0.

The hypersurfaces Σ_t are graphs. For each $t \in [0, T]$, $\varphi(t) : D_0 \to D(t)$ is a diffeomorphism and $\Sigma_t = graph(w(t))$, for $w(t) : D(t) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $w(t) = u(t) \circ \varphi^{-1}(t)$. (We have $w(t) \in C^{2+\alpha^2}(D(t))$, 'less regular' than $u(t)$ or $\varphi(t)$.) $D(t)$ is a uniformly $C^{2+\alpha}$ domain.

Remark 8.1. This theorem does not address geometric uniqueness of the motion, given Σ_0. It only asserts uniqueness for solutions of the parametrized flow (including the orthogonality boundary condition) in the given regularity class.

9. Rotational symmetry. In this section we record the equations for two rotationally symmetric instances of the problem: (i) D_0 and $D(t)$ are disks, and $u > 0$ ('lens' case); (ii) D_0 and $D(t)$ are complements of disks in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ('exterior' case). For simplicity we restrict to $n = 2$.

Let $F(r) = [\varphi(r), u(r)]$ parametrize a hypersurface Σ, where $\varphi(r) = \phi(r)e_r$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image. Here e_r, e_θ are orthonormal vectors, outward normal (resp. counterclockwise tangent) to the circles r=const. The unit upward normal vector and mean curvature are:

$$N = \frac{[-u_r e_r, \phi_r]}{\sqrt{u_r^2 + \phi_r^2}},$$

$$H = \frac{1}{(\phi_r^2 + u_r^2)^{3/2}}(\phi_r \mathcal{M}(\phi_r, u_r)[D^2u] - \langle u_r e_r, \vec{\mathcal{M}}(\phi_r, u_r[D^2\varphi]\rangle),$$

where:

$$\mathcal{M}(\phi_r, u_r)[D^2u] = u_{rr} + (\phi_r^2 + u_r^2)\frac{u_r\phi_r}{\phi^2},$$

$$\vec{\mathcal{M}}(\phi_r, u_r)[D^2\varphi] = [\phi_{rr} + (\phi_r^2 + u_r^2)(\frac{r\phi_r}{\phi^2} - \frac{1}{\phi})]e_r.$$

Simplifying:

$$H = \frac{1}{(\phi_r^2 + u_r^2)^{3/2}}[\phi_r u_{rr} - u_r\phi_{rr} + (\phi_r^2 + u_r^2)\frac{u_r}{\phi}].$$

Now consider the time-dependent case $F(r,t) = [\phi(r,t)e_r, u(r,t)]$. From the above expressions, one finds easily that the equation $\langle \partial_t F, N\rangle = H$ takes the form:

$$\phi_r(u_t - \frac{1}{\phi_r^2 + u_r^2}\mathcal{M}(\phi_r, u_r)[D^2 u]) = u_r\langle e_r, \varphi_t - \frac{1}{\phi_r^2 + u_r^2}\vec{\mathcal{M}}(\phi_r, u_r)[D^2\varphi]\rangle.$$

In 'split gauge', we consider the system:

$$\begin{cases} u_t - \frac{1}{\phi_r^2+u_r^2}\mathcal{M}(\phi_r, u_r)[D^2 u] = 0, \\ \varphi_t - \frac{1}{\phi_r^2+u_r^2}\vec{\mathcal{M}}(\phi_r, u_r)[D^2\varphi] = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\phi(r,t) = r$ solves the ϕ equation, and that in this case the u equation becomes:

$$w_t - \frac{w_{rr}}{1 + w_r^2} - \frac{w_r}{r} = 0.$$

This can be compared with the equation for curve networks:

$$w_t - \frac{w_{xx}}{1 + w_x^2} = 0.$$

The boundary conditions are easily stated (we assume D_0 is the unit disk or its complement).

The 'contact condition' at $r = 1$ is $u = 0$. For the 'angle condition' at $r = 1$, we find:

$$u_r^2 = \frac{\beta_0^2}{\beta^2}\phi_r^2, \quad \beta_0 := \sqrt{1 - \beta^2}.$$

Assuming $\phi_r > 0$ at $r = 1$, this resolves as:

$$\beta u_r + \beta_0 \phi_r = 0 \text{ at } r = 1 \text{ (lens case);}$$

$$\beta u_r - \beta_0 \phi_r = 0 \text{ at } r = 1 \text{ (exterior case).}$$

(For lenses, one also has at $r = 0$: $u_r = 0$ and $\phi_r = 1$.) Thus in both cases one can work with *linear* Dirichlet/Neumann-type boundary conditions.

One reason to consider the exterior case is that (unlike the lens case) it admits stationary solutions. Geometrically, one just has to consider one-half of a catenoid, truncated at an appropriate height. For example, for 120 degree junctions the equation for stationary solutions:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{u_{rr}}{1+u_r^2} + \frac{u_r}{r} = 0 \text{ in } \{r > 1\}, \\ u_{r|r=1} = \sqrt{3}, \quad u_{|r=1} = 0 \end{cases}$$

admits the explicit solution:

$$u(r) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(\ln(2r + \sqrt{4r^2 - 3}) - \ln 3), \quad r > \sqrt{3}/2.$$

Problem. It would be interesting to consider the nonlinear dynamical stability of this solution (even linear stability is yet to be considered.) One may even work with bounded domains, by introducing a fixed boundary at some $R > 1$, intersecting the surface orthogonally (see Section 10.)

10. Fixed supporting hypersurfaces. Extending the local existence theorem to the case of hypersurfaces intersecting a fixed hypersurface $\mathcal{S}$ orthogonally presents no essential difficulty. The case of vertical support surface leads directly to graph evolution with a standard Neumann condition on a fixed boundary; we consider the complementary case where $\mathcal{S}$ is a graph. Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a C^4 embedded hypersurface (not necessarily connected), the graph over $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of $B \in C^4(\mathcal{D})$, oriented by the upward unit normal:

$$\nu(y) := \frac{1}{v_B}\tilde{\nu}(y), \quad \tilde{\nu}(y) := [-DB(y), 1] \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \quad v_B := \sqrt{1 + |DB(y)|^2}.$$

ν is assumed to be nowhere vertical in $\mathcal{D}$ ($DB \neq 0$). To state the problem in the graph parametrization, we consider a time-dependent domain $D(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with boundary consisting of two components $\partial_1 D(t)$ and $\partial_2 D(t)$, both moving. The hypersurface Σ_t is the graph of $w(\cdot, t)$ over $D(t)$, solving the parabolic equation:

$$w_t - g^{ij}(Dw)w_{ij} = 0 \text{ in } E := \bigcup_{t \in [0,T]} D(t) \times \{t\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times [0, T],$$

with boundary conditions:

$$w(\cdot, t)_{|\partial_1 D(t)} = 0, \quad \sqrt{1 + |Dw|^2}_{|\partial_1 D(t)} = 1/\beta$$

(as before), and on $\partial_2 D(t)$:

$$w = B, \quad \nabla w \cdot \nabla B = -1.$$

(The first-order condition on $\partial_2 D(t)$ is equivalent to $\langle \nu, N \rangle = 0$).

Differentiating in t the boundary condition $w = B$ leads easily to an equation for the normal velocity of the interface $\Gamma(t) = \partial_2 D(t)$:

$$\dot{\Gamma}_n = \frac{vH}{B_n - w_n}.$$

Note that w_n at $\partial_2 D(t)$ can be computed from B_n, since:

$$-1 = \nabla w \cdot \nabla B = w_n B_n + |\nabla^T B|^2;$$

in particular neither B_n nor w_n can vanish (so both have constant sign on connected components of $\partial_2 D$), and one easily computes: $w_n - B_n = -v_B^2/B_n$.

Let $\Lambda = \Sigma \cap \mathcal{S}$ be the $(n-1)$-manifold of intersection, the graph of w (or B) over $\partial_2 D$. Given the graph parametrizations of Σ and $\mathcal{S}$:

$$G(y) = [y, w(y)], \quad \mathbb{B}(y) = [y, B(y)], \quad y \in \partial_2 D,$$

and $\tau \in T\partial_2 D$, we have the tangent vectors:

$$G_n := [n, w_n] \in T\Sigma, \quad G_B := [\nabla B, -1] = -v_B \nu \in T\Sigma, \quad G_\tau := [\tau, \nabla w \cdot \tau] \in T\Lambda,$$

and the second fundamental forms of Σ and $\mathcal{S}$(for $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ arbitrary):

$$A(dGe, dGe) = \frac{1}{v} d^2 w(e,e), \quad \mathcal{A}(d\mathbb{B}e, d\mathbb{B}e) = \frac{1}{v_B} d^2 B(e,e).$$

From $\langle \nu, N \rangle = 0$ at $\partial_2 D$, it follows easily that (cp. [13]):

$$A(G_\tau, \nu) = -\mathcal{A}(G_\tau, N), \quad \tau \in T\partial D.$$

For the remainder of this section, we concentrate on the boundary conditions at $\partial_2 D_0$. To establish short-time existence, we consider as before the parametrized flow:

$$F_t - tr_g d^2 F = 0, \quad g = g(dF), \quad F = [\varphi, u].$$

The contact and angle boundary conditions are:

$$u_{|\partial_2 D_0} = B \circ \varphi_{|\partial_2 D_0}, \quad \langle N, \nu \circ \varphi \rangle_{|\partial_2 D_0} = 0.$$

Again we have two scalar boundary conditions for $n+1$ components. Here the solution is easier than at the junction. With the notation $F_n = dFn = [\varphi_n, u_n]$, we replace the angle condition by the 'vector Neumann condition':

$$F_n \perp T\mathcal{S}, \text{ or } F_n = -\alpha v_B \nu \text{ on } \partial_2 D_0,$$

where $\alpha : \partial_2 D_0 \to \mathbb{R}$, or equivalently (since this leads to $\alpha = -u_n$):

$$\varphi_n = -u_n (\nabla B \circ \varphi) \text{ on } \partial_2 D_0.$$

Clearly the Neumann condition implies the angle condition $\langle N, \nu \circ \varphi\rangle = 0$, but not conversely. This linear Neumann-type condition can easily be incorporated into the fixed-point existence scheme described earlier.

There is one issue to consider: the 0 and 1st-order compatibility conditions must hold at $\partial_2 D_0$, at $t = 0$. The initial hypersurface Σ_0 uniquely determines w_0 and $D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (satisfying $w_0 = B$ and $\nabla w_0 \cdot \nabla B = -1$ on $\partial_2 D_0$), and then once $\varphi_0 \in Diff(D_0)$ is fixed, $u_0 = w_0 \circ \varphi_0$ is also determined. We may assume:

$$\varphi_0 = id, \quad \varphi_{0n} = \nabla B \text{ on } \partial_2 D_0,$$

so:

$$u_{0n} = \nabla w_0 \cdot \varphi_{0n} = \nabla w_0 \cdot \nabla B = -1 \text{ on } \partial_2 D_0,$$

and then the Neumann condition $F_{0n|\partial_2 D_0} = -v_B \nu$ holds at $t = 0$, on $\partial_2 D_0$.

The first-order compatibility condition is:

$$tr_g d^2 u_0 = u_t = \nabla B \cdot \varphi_t = \nabla B \cdot tr_g d^2 \varphi_0 \text{ on } \partial D_0,$$

or equivalently:

$$tr_g \langle \nu, d^2 F_0\rangle = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_0.$$

(This is not a mean curvature condition; the mean curvature of Σ_0 is $H = tr_g\langle N, d^2 F_0\rangle$.)

From now on we omit the subscript 0, but continue to discuss compatibility at $t = 0$. First observe that the Neumann condition leads to a splitting of the induced metric. Given $\tau \in T\partial_2 D_0$, let $F_\tau = dF\tau \in T\Lambda$. Then (recalling $u_n = -1$ on $\partial_2 D_0$):

$$\langle F_\tau, F_n\rangle = \langle [\tau, dB\tau], [\varphi_n, u_n]\rangle = \nabla B \cdot \tau - \nabla B \cdot \tau = 0.$$

Thus we have:

$$tr_g\langle \nu, d^2 F\rangle = g^{ab}\langle \nu, d^2 F(\tau_a, \tau_b)\rangle + g^{nn}\langle \nu, d^2 F(F_n, F_n)\rangle,$$

for a local basis $\{T_a = dF\tau_a\}_{a=1}^{n-1}$ of $T\Lambda$, with $g_{ab} = \langle T_a, T_b\rangle$ and $g_{nn} = |F_n|^2 = v_B^2$.

Differentiating in n the condition $u_n = \nabla w \cdot \varphi_n$ (assuming, as usual, n extended to a tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of $\partial_2 D_0$ as a self-parallel vector field), we find:

$$u_{nn} = d^2 w(n, \nabla B) + \nabla w \cdot d^2 \varphi(n, n).$$

This is used to compute:

$$\langle \nu, d^2F(n,n)\rangle = \frac{1}{v_B}[u_{nn} - \nabla B \cdot d^2\varphi(n,n)]$$

$$= \frac{1}{v_B}[d^2w(n,\nabla B) + (\nabla w - \nabla B)\cdot d^2\varphi(n,n)]$$

$$= -vA(G_n,\nu) + \frac{1}{v_B}(w_n - B_n)n\cdot d^2\varphi(n,n).$$

Bearing in mind the expression for $w_n - B_n$ found earlier, the compatibility condition may be stated in the form:

$$\frac{v_B}{B_n} n\cdot d^2\varphi(n,n) = -vA(G_n,\nu) + g^{ab}\langle d^2F(\tau_a,\tau_b),\nu\rangle.$$

We are now in the same situation as in section 4: given the 1-jet of φ_0 on $\partial_2 D_0$, we extend φ_0 to a tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of $\partial_2 D_0$ (and then to all of D_0), so that $n\cdot d^2\varphi(n,n)$ has on $\partial_2 D_0$ the value dictated by the compatibility condition (using Lemma 4.1(ii)). We just need to verify that the right-hand side of the above expression depends only on Σ_0, $\mathcal{S}$, and the 1-jet of φ_0 over $\partial_2 D_0$. Clearly only the term $g^{ab}\langle \nu, d^2F(\tau_a,\tau_b)\rangle$ is potentially an issue.

Fix $p\in\partial_2 D_0$, and let $\{\tau_a\}$ be an orthonormal frame for $T\partial_2 D_0$ near p, parallel at p for the connection induced on $\partial_2 D_0$ from $\mathbb{R}^n$. If $\mathcal{K}$ denotes the second fundamental form of $\partial_2 D_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have:

$$\tau_a(\tau_b) = \mathcal{K}(\tau_a,\tau_b)n \quad (\text{ at } p)$$

(on the left-hand-side, τ_b is regarded as a vector-valued function in $\mathbb{R}^n$). Still computing at p, this implies:

$$d^2F(\tau_a,\tau_b) = \tau_a(dF\tau_b) - dF(\tau_a(\tau_b))$$

$$= \tau_a(d\mathbb{B}\tau_b) - \mathcal{K}(\tau_a,\tau_b)F_n$$

$$= d^2\mathbb{B}(\tau_a,\tau_b) + \mathcal{K}(\tau_a,\tau_b)\mathbb{B}_n - \mathcal{K}(\tau_a,\tau_n)F_n,$$

where $F_n = -v\nu$ and $\mathbb{B}_n = d\mathbb{B}n \in T\mathcal{S}$. Hence:

$$\langle \nu, d^2F(\tau_a,\tau_b)\rangle = \langle \nu, d^2\mathbb{B}(\tau_a,\tau_b)\rangle + v\mathcal{K}(\tau_a,\tau_b) = \mathcal{A}(T_a,T_b) + v\mathcal{K}(\tau_a,\tau_b).$$

This clearly depends only on $\mathcal{S}$ and on Σ_0. We summarize the discussion in a lemma.

Lemma 10.1 Let $\Sigma_0 = graph(w_0)$ be a C^3 graph over $D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (a uniformly C^3 domain), intersecting a fixed hypersurface $\mathcal{S} = graph(B)$ over ∂D_0. Consider the parametrized mean curvature motion with Neumann boundary condition:

$$F \in C^{2,1}(D_0 \times [0,T]) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \quad F = [\varphi, u]$$

$$F_t - tr_g d^2 F = 0, \quad g = g(dF), \quad u \circ \varphi = B \text{ and } F_n \perp T\mathcal{S} \text{ on } \partial D_0.$$

Then $\varphi_0 \in Diff(D_0)$ can be chosen so that (with $u_0 = w_0 \circ \varphi_0$) the initial data $F_0 = [\varphi_0, u_0]$ satisfies the order zero and the first-order compatibility conditions at $t = 0$ and ∂D_0:

$$\varphi_{0n} = -u_{0n}(\nabla B \circ \varphi_0), \quad \langle \nu \circ \varphi_0, tr_{g_0} d^2 F_0 \rangle = 0.$$

Remark 10.1. Differentiating $dw\tau_a = dB\tau_a$ along τ_b, we find:

$$d^2 w(\tau_a, \tau_b) - d^2 B(\tau_a, \tau_b) = (w_n - B_n)\mathcal{K}(\tau_a, \tau_b)$$

(reminding us that, although $w \equiv B$ on ∂D_0, the tangential components of their Hessians do not coincide.) From this follows the expression for $\mathcal{K}$ in terms of A and $\mathcal{A}$:

$$\mathcal{K}(\tau_a, \tau_b) = \frac{1}{w_n - B_n}[vA(T_a, T_b) - v_B \mathcal{A}(T_a, T_b)].$$

It is also easy to express the corresponding traces in terms of the mean curvatures H^Λ and $\mathcal{H}^\Lambda$ of Λ in Σ and $\mathcal{S}$:

$$H^\Lambda = \frac{v}{v_B} g^{ab} A(T_a, T_b), \quad \mathcal{H}^\Lambda = \frac{v_B}{v} g^{ab} \mathcal{A}(T_a, T_b).$$

11. Boundary conditions for the second fundamental form.

To understand the long-term behavior of a graph (Σ_t) in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ moving by mean curvature and intersecting $\mathbb{R}^n$ at a constant angle, we need to consider the evolution of its second fundamental form. Working in the graph parametrization the boundary conditions are easy to state (and linear):

$$w_{|\partial D(t)} = 0, \qquad d_n w_{|\partial D(t)} = \frac{\beta_0}{\beta},$$

where $n = n_t$ is the inner unit normal to $\partial D(t)$. It is possible to reparametrize the Σ_t over a different time-dependent domain $\mathcal{D}(t)$, obtaining mean curvature flow:

$$\mathcal{F}_t : \mathcal{D}(t) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \qquad \partial_t \mathcal{F} = HN,$$

with boundary conditions:

$$\mathcal{F}^{n+1}_{|\partial\mathcal{D}(t)} = 0, \qquad N^{n+1}_{|\partial\mathcal{D}(t)} = \beta.$$

For this parametrization the evolution equation for the second fundamental form (and its covariant derivatives of arbitrary order) is well-understood [5]. The disadvantage is that the unit normal $N_{|\mathcal{F}_t}$ depends non-linearly on the components of $\mathcal{F}$, and as a result the boundary conditions for the second fundamental form (which are needed for global estimates over spacetime domains) do not admit simple expressions. Therefore we choose to work with graph flow, at the cost of having to derive and understand a new set of evolution equations. The equations for h and the mean curvature H are derived in an appendix. In this section we derive boundary conditions; the development is similar to work of A. Stahl [13] for MCF of hypersurfaces intersecting a fixed boundary orthogonally.

It is easy to see that h splits on $\partial D(t)$: if $\tau \in T\partial D(t)$ is a tangential vector field, and $n = n_t$ is the inner unit normal:

$$h(n,\tau) = \frac{1}{v} d^2 w(n,\tau) = \frac{1}{v}(\tau(w_n) - Dw \cdot \bar{\nabla}_\tau n) = 0 \text{ on } \partial D(t),$$

since $w_n \equiv \beta_0/\beta$ on the boundary and $\bar{\nabla}_\tau n \in T\partial D(t)$ ($\bar{\nabla}$ is the euclidean connection.) In particular, it follows that $h(Dw,\tau) = 0$ on $\partial D(t)$.

Remark. Already this simple fact cannot be shown for $a(\nu,\tau)$, the second fundamental form in the MCF parametrization, regarded as a quadratic form on $\mathcal{D}(t)$.

Boundary condition for H. We derived in section 2 the equation for the normal velocity of the moving boundary $\Gamma_t = \partial D(t)$:

$$\dot{\Gamma}_n = -\frac{v}{w_n} H = -\frac{1}{\beta_0} H \quad \text{at } \partial D(t).$$

Since $\langle N, e_{n+1}\rangle(\Gamma(t), t) \equiv \beta$ on $\partial D(t)$ we have:

$$\langle \partial_t N, e_{n+1}\rangle = -\langle \partial_k N, e_{n+1}\rangle \dot{\Gamma}^k,$$

where $\partial_k N = -g^{ij} h_{ik} G_j$, with e_{n+1} component:

$$\langle \partial_k N, e_{n+1}\rangle = -g^{ij} w_j h_{ik} = -\frac{1}{v^2} h(Dw, \partial_k) = -\frac{1}{v^2} w_n h(n, \partial_k).$$

Hence we find, on $\partial D(t)$:

$$\langle \partial_t N, e_{n+1}\rangle = \frac{w_n}{v^2} h(n, \dot{\Gamma}) = \frac{w_n}{v^2} \dot{\Gamma}_n h(n, n) = -\beta H h_{nn}. \qquad (11.1)$$

(We set $h_{nn} := h(n, n)$). Denote by ∇^Σ the gradient of Σ_t, in the induced metric ($\nabla^\Sigma f = g^{ij} f_i G_j$). Using $\partial_t N = -\nabla^\Sigma H - H v^{-1} \nabla^\Sigma v$, combined with the expressions (valid on $\partial D(t)$):

$$\langle \nabla^\Sigma H, e_{n+1}\rangle = g^{ij} H_i \langle G_j, e_{n+1}\rangle = g^{ij} H_i w_j = \frac{1}{v^2} w_i H_i = \frac{w_n}{v^2} H_n = \beta\beta_0 H_n,$$

$$\langle \nabla^\Sigma v, e_{n+1}\rangle = \frac{v_n w_n}{v^2} = \frac{w_n^2}{v^2} h_{nn} = \beta_0^2 h_{nn},$$

we find on $\partial D(t)$:

$$\langle \partial_t N, e_{n+1}\rangle = -\beta\beta_0 (H_n + \beta_0 H h_{nn}). \qquad (11.2)$$

Comparing expressions for (11.1) and (11.2) for $\langle \partial_t N, e_{n+1}\rangle$ yields a Neumann-type condition for H. We state this as a lemma (including the evolution equation derived in the appendix). Here $L = L_g$ denotes the operator $L[f] = \partial_t f - tr_g D^2 f$ and $\omega = Dw/v$, a vector field in $D(t)$.

Lemma 11.1. For the surfaces Σ_t evolving by graph mean curvature motion with constant contact angle, the mean curvature satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} L[H] = |h|_g^2 H + H h^2(\omega, \omega) - H^2 h(\omega, \omega) & \text{on } D(t) \\ d_n H = \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0} H h_{nn} & \text{on } \partial D(t) \end{cases}$$

Boundary conditions for h_{ij}. Fix $p \in \partial D(t)$ and let (τ_a) be an orthonormal frame for $T_p\partial D(t)$ (in the induced metric), satisfying $\nabla^\Gamma_{\tau_a}\tau_b(p) = 0$ (∇^Γ is the connection induced on Γ_t by the euclidean connection d, or, equivalently, by ∇, the Levi-Civita connection of the metric g in $D(t)$); we extend the τ_a to a tubular neighborhood of Γ_t so that $\bar{\nabla}_n\tau_a = 0$. Differentiating $h(n, \tau_b) = 0$ along τ_a, we find:

$$(\nabla_{\tau_a}h)(n, \tau_b) = -h(\nabla_{\tau_a}n, \tau_b) - h(n, \nabla_{\tau_a}\tau_b). \qquad (11.3)$$

The second fundamental form $\mathcal{K}(\tau, \tau')$ of Γ_t in $(D(t), eucl)$ (equivalently, in $(D(t), g)$) is defined by:

$$d_{\tau_a}\tau_b = \nabla^\Gamma_{\tau_a}\tau_b + \mathcal{K}(\tau_a, \tau_b)n \quad \text{ on } \partial D(t).$$

To relate $\mathcal{K}$ to $h_{|\partial D(t)}$, note that since $w = 0$ on $\partial D(t)$:

$$h(\tau_a, \tau_b) = \frac{1}{v}d^2w(\tau_a, \tau_b) = \frac{1}{v}(\tau_a(\tau_b w) - Dw \cdot d_{\tau_a}\tau_b) = -d_{\tau_a}\tau_b \cdot \frac{Dw}{v} = -\beta_0\mathcal{K}(\tau_a, \tau_b).$$

(So we see that Γ_t convex with respect to n corresponds to Σ_t *concave* over $D(t)$, as expected). In the appendix we observe that $\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j = (h_{ij}/v)Dw$. Then:

$$\nabla_{\tau_a}\tau_b = \tau_a^i((\tau_b^j)_i\partial_j + \tau_b^j\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j) = d_{\tau_a}\tau_b + \frac{1}{v}\tau_a^i\tau_b^j h_{ij}Dw$$

$$= \nabla^\Gamma_{\tau_a}\tau_b + \mathcal{K}(\tau_a, \tau_b)n + \frac{w_n}{v}h(\tau_a, \tau_b)n = (-\frac{1}{\beta_0} + \beta_0)h(\tau_a, \tau_b)n = -\frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0}h(\tau_a, \tau_b)n$$

at p, given our assumption $\nabla^\Gamma_{\tau_a}\tau_b(p) = 0$. We use this immediately to compute, at p:

$$\nabla_{\tau_a}n = \langle\nabla_{\tau_a}n, \tau_b\rangle_g\tau_b = -\langle n, \nabla_{\tau_a}\tau_b\rangle_g\tau_b = \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0}|n|_g^2 h(\tau_a, \tau_b)\tau_b = \frac{1}{\beta_0}h(\tau_a, \tau_b)\tau_b,$$

since $|n|_g^2 = g_{ij}n^in^j = 1 + w_n^2 = \beta^{-2}$ at p. Using these expressions for $\nabla_{\tau_a}n$ and $\nabla_{\tau_a}\tau_b$ in (11.3) above and recalling the Codazzi equations:

$$(\nabla_n h)(\tau_a, \tau_b) = (\nabla_{\tau_a}h)(n, \tau_b) = -\frac{1}{\beta_0}\sum_c h(\tau_a, \tau_c)h(\tau_c, \tau_b) + \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0}h(\tau_a, \tau_b)h_{nn}.$$

This can also be written in the form:

$$\beta_0(\nabla_n h)(\tau, \tau') = -(h^{tan})^2(\tau, \tau') + \beta^2 h_{nn}h(\tau, \tau'). \quad (11.4)$$

It turns out the expression for the n-directional derivative of $h(\tau,\tau')$ is exactly the same (at $\partial D(t)$):

$$\beta_0 d_n(h(\tau,\tau')) = -(h^{tan})^2(\tau,\tau') + \beta^2 h_{nn} h(\tau,\tau'). \quad (11.5)$$

The reason is that $\nabla_n \tau_a = 0$ at the boundary, also for the g-connection:

$$\nabla_n \tau_a = d_n(\tau_a) + n^i \tau_a^j \nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j = 0 + \frac{1}{v} h(n,\tau_a) Dw = 0,$$

so in fact:

$$(\nabla_n h)(\tau_a,\tau_b) = n(h(\tau_a,\tau_b)) = d_n(h(\tau_a,\tau_b)).$$

As done in [13], we combine this with the result for H_n to compute $(\nabla_n h)(n,n)$. From:

$$H_n = \nabla_n(tr_g h) = tr_g(\nabla_n h) = \beta^2(\nabla_n h)(n,n) + \sum_a (\nabla_n h)(\tau_a,\tau_a).$$

Here we used $|n|_g^2 = \beta^{-2}$ on $\partial D(t)$, which also implies $H = \beta^2 h_{nn} + \sum_a h(\tau_a,\tau_a)$. Using also $|h^{tan}|^2 = \sum (h^{tan})^2(\tau_a,\tau_a)$, we find for $(\nabla_n h)(n,n)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta^2(\nabla_n h)(n,n) &= \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0} H h_{nn} + \frac{1}{\beta_0}|h^{\tan}|^2 - \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0}(H - \beta^2 h_{nn}) h_{nn} \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta_0}(|h^{tan}|^2 + \beta^4 h_{nn}^2) = \frac{1}{\beta_0}|h|_g^2,\end{aligned}$$

since $g^{nn} = \beta^2$ at $\partial D(t)$. Equivalently:

$$\beta_0(\nabla_n h)(n,n) = \frac{1}{\beta^2}|h|_g^2 \quad \text{on } \partial D(t).$$

It is easy to obtain the corresponding expression for the euclidean connection. Noting that at $\partial D(t)$:

$$\nabla_n n = d_n n + n^i n^j \frac{1}{v} h_{ij} Dw = \beta_0 h_{nn} n,$$

we find:

$$(d_n h)(n,n) = n(h_{nn}) = (\nabla_n h)(n,n) + 2h(\nabla_n n, n) = (\nabla_n h)(n,n) + 2\beta_0 h_{nn}^2,$$

so that:

$$\beta_0 d_n(h(n,n)) = \frac{1}{\beta^2}|h|_g^2 + 2\beta_0^2 h_{nn}^2 \quad \text{on } \partial D(t).$$

We record these results as a lemma, including also the evolution equations derived in the appendix.

Lemma 11.2. Under graph mean curvature motion with constant contact angle, the second fundamental form satisfies the following tensorial evolution equations. (C_{ij} and $\bar{C}_{ij}$ are symmetric 2-tensors cubic in h, given explicitly in the appendix.)

(i) For the operator $L = L_g$:

$$L[h_{ij}] = -2[h_i^k d_\omega(h_{jk}) + h_j^k d_\omega(h_{ik})] + \bar{C}_{ij} \text{ on } D(t),$$

with boundary conditions on $\partial D(t)$:

$$\begin{cases} h(n,\tau) = 0 \\ \beta_0 d_n(h(\tau,\tau')) = -(h^{tan})^2(\tau,\tau') + \beta^2 h_{nn} h(\tau,\tau') \\ \beta_0 d_n(h(n,n)) = \frac{1}{\beta^2}|h|_g^2 + 2\beta_0^2 h_{nn}^2 \end{cases}$$

(ii) For the operator $\partial_t - \Delta_g$, where Δ_g is the Laplace-Beltrami operator of g:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta_g)[h]_{ij} = H(\nabla_\omega h)_{ij} + H_i h(\omega, \partial_j) + H_j h(\omega, \partial_i) + C_{ij} \text{ on } D(t),$$

with boundary conditions on $\partial D(t)$:

$$\begin{cases} h(n,\tau) = 0 \\ \beta_0(\nabla_n h)(\tau,\tau') = -(h^{tan})^2(\tau,\tau') + \beta^2 h_{nn} h(\tau,\tau') \\ \beta_0(\nabla_n h)(n,n) = \frac{1}{\beta^2}|h|_g^2 \end{cases}$$

It is also useful to compute the boundary condition for $|h|_g^2$. Using Lemma 11.2(ii), we have at $\partial D(t)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\beta_0/2) d_n |h|_g^2 = \beta_0 \langle \nabla_n h, h \rangle_g \\ &= \beta_0 \beta^4 (\nabla_n h)(n,n) h_{nn} + \beta_0 \textstyle\sum_{b,c} (\nabla_n h)(\tau_a,\tau_b) h(\tau_a,\tau_b) \\ &= \beta^2 |h|_g^2 h_{nn} + \textstyle\sum_{a,b} [-(h^{tan})^2(\tau_a,\tau_b) + \beta^2 h_{nn} h(\tau_a,\tau_b)] h(\tau_a,\tau_b) \\ &= \beta^2 (|h|_g^2 + |h^{tan}|_g^2) h_{nn} - tr_g(h^{tan})^3 \end{aligned}$$

Since on $\partial D(t)$: $tr_g h^3 = \beta^6 (h_{nn})^3 + tr_g(h^{tan})^3$, we may state this in a slightly different form. Including also the evolution equation for $|h|_g^2$ (see appendix), we have the following lemma.

Lemma 11.3. Under graph mean curvature flow, the function $|h|_g^2$ satisfies the evolution equation and Neumann boundary condition:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t - \Delta_g)|h|_g^2 = -2|\nabla h|_g^2 + H d_\omega |h|_g^2 + 2|h|_g^4 - 4Hh^3(\omega,\omega) - 2H|h|_g^2 h(\omega,\omega) \\ (\beta_0/2) d_n |h|_g^2 = 2\beta^2 |h|_g^2 h_{nn} - tr_g(h^3) \text{ on } \partial D(t) \end{cases}$$

12. A maximum principle for symmetric 2-tensors.

By the local existence theorem, for suitable initial data we have a mean curvature motion $F = [\varphi, u] \in C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}(Q_0, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, where $Q_0 = D_0 \times [0,T]$ and, for each $t \in [0,T]$, $\varphi_t : D_0 \to D(t)$ is a $C^{2+\alpha}$ diffeomorphism. In particular, with $\delta = \alpha^2$, $w_t = u_t \circ \varphi_t^{-1} : D(t) \to \mathbb{R}$ defines a graph m.c.m. $w \in C^{2+\delta,1+\delta/2}(E;\mathbb{R})$ in an open spacetime domain

$$E = \bigcup_{t\in(0,T)} D(t) \times \{t\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}.$$

We have a $C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}$ diffeomorphism:

$$\Phi : \bar{Q_0} \to \bar{E}, \quad \Phi(x,t) = (\varphi_t(x), t),$$

which, for any $t_0 > 0$, restricts to a diffeomorphism $Q_{t_0} \to E_{t_0}$, where:

$$Q_{t_0} = D_0 \times (t_0, T), \qquad E_{t_0} = \bigcup_{t\in(t_0,T)} D(t) \times \{t\}.$$

The parabolic boundary of E is the disjoint union of 'base' and 'lateral boundary':

$$\partial_p E = (\bar{D}_0 \times \{0\}) \sqcup \partial_l E, \quad \partial_l E = \bigcup_{t\in(0,T)} \partial D(t) \times \{t\}.$$

(The notions of 'parabolic boundary, 'base' and 'lateral boundary' have general definitions for arbitrary bounded spacetime domains (see [8]), but using Φ it is easy to see that they are given by the above sets.) In particular, note that Φ defines a diffeomorphism ($C^{k+\alpha,(k+\alpha)/2}$ up to the lateral boundary, if D_0 is a $C^{k+\alpha}$ domain and $F \in C^{k+\alpha,(k+\alpha)/2}(Q_0)$):

$$Q_{t_0} \cup \partial_l Q_{t_0} \to E_{t_0} \cup \partial_l E_{t_0},$$

for each $t_0 > 0$.

Denote by L the operator $L = \partial_t - g^{ij}(Dw)\partial_i\partial_j$, so $Lw = 0$ in E and $w = 0$ on $\partial_l E$. The following height bound is immediate.

Lemma 12.1. Assume $0 < w_0 < M$ in D_0. Then $0 \leq w \leq M$ in $\bar{E}$ (and vanishes only on $\partial_l E$).

Proof. Follows from the weak maximum principle for the operator L, since $0 \leq w \leq M$ holds on the parabolic boundary $\partial_p E$.

It is well-known that the function $v = \sqrt{1 + |Dw|^2}$ solves the evolution equation (assuming $Dw \in C^{2,1}(\bar{E})$, see e.g. [4]):

$$L[v] + \frac{2}{v} g^{ij} v_i v_j = -v|h|_g^2, \text{ or } L[v] = -\frac{2}{v}|Dv|_g^2 - v|h|_g^2.$$

From the maximum principle, we have the following global bound on v (equivalently, on $|Dw|$).

Lemma 12.2 Assume w is a solution with $Dw \in C^{2,1}(\bar{E})$. Then we have on $\bar{E}$:

$$v(z) \leq \max\{sup_{D(t_0)} v(x, t_0), \frac{1}{\beta}\}.$$

Proof. By the weak maximum principle, $\max_{\bar{E}} v = \max_{\partial_p E} v$. Note $v_{|S} \equiv \frac{1}{\beta}$.

It follows from this lemma that $g_{ij}(t)$ is uniformly equivalent to the euclidean metric in $D(t)$: if $v \leq \bar{v}$ in $\bar{E}$, and X is a vector field in $D(t)$:

$$|X|_e^2 \leq |X|_g^2 = g_{ij} X^i X^j = |X|_e^2 + (X \cdot Dw)^2 \leq |X|_e^2(1 + |Dw|^2) \leq \bar{v}^2 |X|_e^2.$$

Also, if $\omega := v^{-1} Dw$:

$$|\omega|_e^2 = \frac{|Dw|_e^2}{v^2} = 1 - \frac{1}{v^2} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\bar{v}^2}.$$

The main result in this section is a maximum principle for symmetric 2-tensors satisfying a parabolic equation on a spacetime domain such as E (image of a cylinder under a diffeomorphism of the special type Φ).

Recall the 'boundary point lemma' for scalar equations . It holds for open spacetime domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying an 'interior ball condition':

Interior ball condition: For each $P = (p, \bar{t}) \in \partial_l \Omega$ we may find a ball B (in the euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$) which is tangent to $\partial_l \Omega$ only at P and satisfies: (i) the line segment from P to the center of the ball is not parallel to the t axis; (ii) $B \cap \{t \leq \bar{t}\} \subset \Omega \cap \{t \leq \bar{t}\}$.

Remark. For the domain of interest the interior ball condition follows from the fact that $\partial_l E = \Phi(\partial D_0 \times (0,T))$, with $\Phi \in C^{2,1}(D_0 \times (0,T))$ of the special form above.

Lemma 12.3.([12] Thm.6, p.174.) Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+$ be a connected open set satisfying the interior ball condition. Assume $f \in C^{2,1}(\Omega)$ satisfies the uniformly parabolic inequality:

$$\partial_t f - tr_g d^2 f - d_X f \leq 0.$$

Here $g = g_t$ is a Riemannian metric in each section $\Omega(t)$, and X_t is a bounded vector field in $\Omega(t)$. Denote by $n = n_t$ the inner unit normal of $\Omega(t)$.

Assume the supremum M of f in $\Omega_{\bar{t}} := \Omega \cap \{t \leq \bar{t}\}$ is attained at the point $P \in \partial\Omega(\bar{t})$, and that $f < M$ for $t < \bar{t}$. Then $d_n f(P) < 0$.

We now state the hypotheses of our tensorial maximum principle.

$E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ is the image of a cylinder $D_0 \times (0,T)$ under a $C^{3,2}$ diffeomorphism Φ of the form $\Phi(x,t) = (\varphi_t(x), t)$, with $\varphi_t : D_0 \to D(t)$ a C^3 diffeomorphism up to the boundary, for each $t \in [0,T]$ ($D(t)$ is the $t = const.$ section of E); $\bar{D_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is assumed to be the image of the closed unit ball under a C^3 diffeomorphism.) In particular, the lateral boundary $\partial_l E$ is of class $C^{3,2}$. On $\partial_l E$ we have the *inner* unit normal $n = n_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Extend n_t to a vector field in all of $\bar{D}(t)$ so that it is in $C^{2,1}(\bar{E}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, arbitrarily except for the requirements that $|n| \leq 1$ pointwise and $d_n n = 0$ in a tubular neighborhood of $\partial D(t)$ (equivalently, $n^i \partial_i n^j = 0$ for each j.) Fix $R > 0$ so that $D(t) \subset B_R(0)$, for each $t \in [0,T]$

The assumptions on the coefficients are given next.

$g = g_t$ is a t-dependent Riemannian metric in $\bar{D}(t)$, uniformly equivalent to the euclidean metric for $t \in [0,T]$;

$X = X_t$ is a bounded t-dependent vector field in $\bar{D}(t)$;

$q = q(z,m)$ assigns to each $z \in \bar{E}$ and each m in $\mathbb{S}$ (the space of quadratic forms in $\mathbb{R}^n$) a quadratic form $q \in \mathbb{S}$. q is assumed to be $C^{2,1}$ in z, locally Lipschitz in m (uniformly in $z \in \bar{E}$);

$b = b(z,m) \in \mathbb{S}$ is defined for $z \in \partial_l E$, with the same regularity assumptions as q.

Remark. We state the following theorem in terms of the Laplace-Beltrami heat operator $\partial_t - \Delta_g$ and the g- Riemannian connection ∇, but the result also holds for L and the 'euclidean connection' d.

Theorem 12.1. Assume $m \in C^{2,1}(\bar{E}; \mathbb{S})$ satisfies in E the tensorial differential inequality:

$$\partial_t m_{ij} - (\Delta_g m)_{ij} \leq (\nabla_X m)_{ij} + q_{ij}(\cdot, m(\cdot)),$$

and on $\partial_l E$ the boundary condition:

$$(\nabla_n m)_{ij}(z) \geq b_{ij}(z, m(z)).$$

Suppose the functions q and b satisfy the following 'null eigenvector conditions': if, for some $\hat{m} \in \mathbb{S}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a null eigenvector of $\hat{m}$ ($\hat{m}_{ij}V^j = 0 \forall i$), then, for any $z \in \bar{E}$ (resp. any $z \in \partial_l E$):

$$q_{ij}(z, \hat{m})V^i V^j \leq 0 \quad \text{(resp. } b_{ij}(z, \hat{m})V^i V^j \geq 0\text{)}.$$

Then weak concavity of m at $t = 0$ is preserved:

$$m \leq 0 \text{ in } D(0) \Rightarrow m \leq 0 \text{ in } \bar{E}.$$

Proof. The assumptions imply there is $K > 0$ (depending only on E and on the functions X, g, n, q and b) satisfying:

$$|n|_{C^{2,1}(\bar{E})} \leq K, \quad |X(z)|_{eucl} \leq K, \quad |g(z)| + |g^{-1}(z)| \leq K, \quad z \in \bar{E};$$

and if $m, \hat{m} \in C^{2,1}(\bar{E}, \mathbb{S})$ satisfy (for some $\mu : \bar{E} \to \mathbb{R}_+$):

$$-\mu(z)g \leq m(z) - \hat{m}(z) \leq \mu(z)g$$

(where the inequality of quadratic forms has the usual meaning), then also:

$$q(z, m(z)) \leq q(z, \hat{m}(z)) + K\mu(z)g, \quad z \in \bar{E},$$

$$b(z, m(z)) \geq b(z, \hat{m}(z)) - K\mu(z)g, \quad z \in \partial_l E.$$

Now define, for $z \in \bar{E}$, $z = (x, t)$:

$$\varphi(z) := -2Kn(z) \cdot x := 2Ks(z),$$

where we use the euclidean inner product and, on $\partial_l E$, s is the 'support function' of $\partial D(t)$ (positive if $D(t)$ is convex and contains the origin). It is clear we may find $M = M(R, K) > 0$ depending only on K, R and $|n|_{C^{2,1}}$ so that:

$$|\varphi|_{C^{2,1}} \leq M, \quad |d\varphi|_g^2 + |\Delta_g \varphi| \leq M, \quad |X \cdot d\varphi| \leq M.$$

We assume also $M \geq K$. Now, given m as in the statement of the theorem and given constants $\epsilon > 0, \gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, define for $E^\delta := E \cap \{t < \delta\}$:

$$\hat{m}(z) := m(z) - (\epsilon t + \gamma e^{\varphi(z)})g, \quad z \in \bar{E}^\delta.$$

Clearly $\hat{m} \in C^{2,1}(\bar{E}^\delta; \mathbb{S})$. We now derive the constraints on δ, ϵ and γ. It will turn out that δ must be taken small enough (depending only on K, R), $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary and γ is ϵ times a constant depending only on K, R.

The following inequalities are easily derived:

$$q(z, m(z)) \leq q(z, \hat{m}(z)) + K(\epsilon t + \gamma e^{\varphi(z)})g;$$

$$\nabla_X m = \nabla_X \hat{m} + \gamma(e^\varphi d_X \varphi)g \leq \nabla_X \hat{m} + (\gamma e^\varphi M)g;$$

$$\partial_t \hat{m} = \partial_t m - \epsilon g - (\gamma e^\varphi \partial_t \varphi)g \leq \partial_t m + (\gamma e^\varphi M)g - \epsilon g;$$

$$\Delta_g \hat{m} = \Delta_g d^2 \hat{m} - \gamma e^\varphi (|d\varphi|_g^2 + \Delta_g \varphi)g \geq \Delta_g m - (\gamma e^\varphi M)g.$$

$$b(z, m(z)) \geq b(z, \hat{m}(z)) - K(\epsilon t + \gamma e^\varphi)g$$

We use this to compute:

$$\partial_t \hat{m} - \Delta_g \hat{m} \leq \partial_t m - \Delta_g m + (2\gamma e^\varphi M)g - \epsilon g$$

$$\leq q(z, m(z)) + \nabla_X m + (2\gamma e^\varphi M)g - \epsilon g$$

$$\leq q(z, \hat{m}(z)) + \nabla_X \hat{m} + K(\epsilon t + \gamma e^\varphi)g + (3M\gamma e^\varphi)g - \epsilon g$$

$$\leq q(z, \hat{m}(z)) + \nabla_X \hat{m} + M\epsilon t g + 4M\gamma e^\varphi g - \epsilon g$$

(using $K \leq M$ in the last step). We conclude the inequality:

$$\partial_t \hat{m} - \Delta_g \hat{m} \leq q(z, \hat{m}(z)) + \nabla_X \hat{m} - (\epsilon/2)g \qquad (13.1)$$

will hold in E^δ, provided the constants are selected so that, for $z \in E^\delta$:

$$4M\gamma e^{\varphi(z)} + M\epsilon t \leq \epsilon/2. \qquad (A)$$

Turning to boundary points $z = (x, t) \in \partial_l E$, note that $d_n \varphi = -2K$, so that:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_n \hat{m}(z) = \nabla_n m(z) - (\gamma e^{\varphi(z)} d_n\varphi(z))g &\geq b(z, m(z)) - (\gamma e^{\varphi(z)} d_n\varphi(z))g \\ \geq b(z, \hat{m}(z)) - K(\epsilon t + \gamma e^{\varphi(z)})g &- (\gamma e^{\varphi(z)} d_n\varphi(z))g \\ \geq b(z, \hat{m}(z)) &+ K(\gamma e^{\varphi(z)} - \epsilon t)g,\end{aligned}$$

implying the inequality:

$$\nabla_n \hat{m}(z) \geq b(z, \hat{m}), \quad z \in \partial_l E^\delta \qquad (13.2)$$

will hold provided the constants are chosen so that, on $\partial_l E^\delta$:

$$\epsilon t \leq \gamma e^{\varphi(z)}. \qquad (B)$$

Bearing in mind that, on E: $e^{-2KR} \leq e^{\varphi(z)} \leq e^{2KR}$, it is not hard to arrange for (A) and (B) to hold, or equivalently, for:

$$\epsilon t \leq \gamma e^{\varphi(z)}, \qquad 10M\gamma e^{\varphi(z)} \leq \epsilon.$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$, define γ so that $10M\gamma e^{2KR} = \epsilon$. Then the second inequality holds, and so will the first, provided:

$$\epsilon t \leq \gamma e^{-2KR} = (\epsilon/10M)e^{-4KR},$$

which is true for any $\epsilon > 0$, if δ is defined via $\delta := e^{-4KR}/10M$ (recall $t \in [0, \delta]$).

Note that, since $m \leq 0$ at $t = 0$, it follows that $\hat{m}$ is negative-definite at $t = 0$, and hence also for small time, and we *claim* that this persists throughout $\bar{E}^\delta$, so that (letting $\epsilon \to 0$) $m \leq 0$ in $\bar{E}^\delta$. Restarting the argument at $t = \delta$, we see this is enough to prove the theorem.

To prove this claim, suppose (by contradiction) $\hat{m}$ acquires a null eigenvector $0 \neq V \in \mathbb{R}^n$ at a point $z_1 = (x_1, t_1) \in \bar{E}^\delta$, with $t_1 \in (0, \delta]$ the first time this happens.

Let $\hat{f}(z) := \hat{m}_{ij}V^iV^j, \quad z \in E^\delta$ (that is, we 'extend' V to E^δ as a constant vector.) It follows from (13.1) that $\hat{f}$ satisfies in E^δ:

$$\partial_t \hat{f} \leq (\Delta_g \hat{m})_{ij}V^iV^j + (\nabla_X \hat{m})_{ij}V^iV^j + q_{ij}(\cdot, \hat{m})V^iV^j - \frac{\epsilon}{2}|V|_g^2.$$

A short and standard Riemannian calculation (using the fact that V is a null eigenvector for $\hat{m}$) shows that:

$$d_X \hat{f} = (\nabla_X \hat{m})_{ij}V^iV^j, \quad \Delta_g \hat{f} = (\Delta_g \hat{m})_{ij}V^iV^j.$$

Using the null eigenvector condition for q, we find that $\hat{f}$ satisfies in E^δ the strict inequality:

$$\partial_t \hat{f} < tr_g d^2 \hat{f} + d_X \hat{f}.$$

This shows x_1 cannot be an interior point of $D(t_1)$, for then (as a first-time interior maximum point for $\hat{f}$) we would have $\Delta_g \hat{f}(z_1) \leq 0$ and $d\hat{f}(z_1) = 0$, contradicting $\partial_t \hat{f}(z_1) \geq 0$. Thus $x_1 \in \partial D(t_1)$. Since $\hat{f}$ satisfies the differential inequality just stated and $z_1 = (x_1, t_1)$ is a first-time boundary maximum in $\bar{E}^\delta$, the parabolic Hopf lemma (Lemma 12.3 above) implies $d_n \hat{f}(z_1) < 0$. On the other hand, as seen above in (13.2):

$$d_n \hat{f} = (\nabla_n \hat{m})_{ij} V^i V^j \geq b_{ij}(z_1, \hat{m}(z_1)) V^i V^j \geq 0,$$

from the boundary null-eigenvector condition. This contradiction concludes the proof.

Corollary 12.2. Suppose $m \in C^{2,1}(\bar{E}, \mathbb{S})$ satisfies the same differential inequality, with the same hypotheses on the coefficients as in the theorem (including the null eigenvector condition for q), and the boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} m(z)(n,\tau) = 0, \quad \forall z = (x,t) \in \partial_l E, \tau \in T_x \partial D(t) \\ (\nabla_n m)(n,n) \geq b_{nn}(z, m(z)) \\ (\nabla_n m)(\tau,\tau) \geq b^{tan}(z, m(z))(\tau,\tau), \quad \tau \in T_x \partial D(t), \end{cases}$$

for functions $b_{nn}(z,\hat{m})$ from $\partial_l E \times \mathbb{S}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ and b^{tan} assigning to $(z,\hat{m}) \in \partial_l E \times \mathbb{S}$, $z = (x,t)$, a quadratic form in $T_x \partial D(t)$. Suppose $b_{nn} \geq 0$ in $E \times \mathbb{S}$ and b^{tan} satisfies for each $\hat{m} \in \mathbb{S}$:

$$\hat{m}_{ij} \tau^i = 0 \text{ for some } \tau \in T_x \partial D(t) \Rightarrow b^{tan}(z,\hat{m})(\tau,\tau) \geq 0.$$

Then, as in the theorem, weak concavity is preserved:

$$m \leq 0 \text{ at } t = 0 \Rightarrow m \leq 0 \text{ in } \bar{E}.$$

Proof. This is proved as the theorem, with the following change in the last part of the proof: if $0 \neq V \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a null eigenvector of $\hat{m}$ (defined as in the proof of the theorem) at a boundary point $z_1 = (x_1, t_1) \in \partial_l E$, write:

$$V = V^n n + V^T, \quad V^T \in T_{x_1} \partial D(t_1).$$

Assume first $V^n \neq 0$. Then (noting that $\hat{m}$ splits at the boundary if m does), we see that n is a null eigenvector of $\hat{m}$ at z_1, so we define

$\hat{f}(z) = \hat{m}_{ij}(z)n^i(z_1)n^j(z_1)$ and repeat the argument. At z_1, $(\nabla_n \hat{m})(n,n) \geq b_{nn}(z_1, \hat{m}(z_1)) \geq 0$ leads to a contradiction with the parabolic Hopf lemma, as before.

If $V^n = 0$, then $V^T \in T_{x_1}\partial D(t_1)$ must be a null eigenvector of $\hat{m}$ at the boundary point z_1, and then we run the argument with $\hat{f}(z) = \hat{m}(z)(V^T, V^T)$, leading to a contradiction, as before.

Corollary 12.3. Let $w \in C^{4,2}(E)$ define a MCM of graphs with constant-angle boundary conditions, where E is as in the statement of theorem 12.1. Then weak concavity is preserved:

$$h \leq 0 \text{ at } t = 0 \Rightarrow h \leq 0 \text{ in } \bar{E}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 11.2, h satisfies:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta_g)h_{ij} = H\nabla_\omega h_{ij} + q(z,h)_{ij},$$

$$q(z,h)_{ij} = H_i h(\omega, \partial_j) + H_j h(\omega, \partial_i) + |h|_g^2 h_{ij} + Hh(\partial_i, \omega)h(\partial_j, \omega) - Hh(\omega,\omega)h_{ij}.$$

(Here H_i, H_j, H and ω^i are regarded as fixed functions of $z \in E$.) Clearly q satisfies the null eigenvector condition, since $q_{ij}V^iV^j = 0$ when $h_{ij}V^j = 0$ for all i. In addition, expressions obtained for $d_n h$ in lemma 11.2 show that the boundary conditions in Corollary 12.2 are satisfied, with:

$$b_{nn}(z, \hat{m}) \equiv 0, \quad b^{tan}(z, \hat{m}) = -((\hat{m})^{tan})^2 + \beta^2 \hat{m}_{nn}\hat{m}^{tan}.$$

Hence the claim follows from Corollary 12.2.

Remark 12.1. For less regular solutions, we may apply the theorem to a domain $E_{t_0} = E \cap \{t > t_0\}$, for arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$. Thus, assuming $h < 0$ at $t = 0$ (strictly negative-definite), we conclude from corollary 13.3 that $h \leq 0$ for all t.

Remark 12.2. It seems plausible that a slightly different version of the result in this section could be used to strengthen the conclusions of [13].

Finite existence time.

It is not difficult to derive that the flow is defined only for finite time in the concave case.

Lemma 12.4. Let $w \in C^{4,2}(E), E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T)$ define a graph MCM Σ_t with constant-angle boundary conditions on a moving boundary. Assume Σ_0 (and hence Σ_t, for all t) is weakly concave. Then:

Assume $H_{|t=0} \leq H_0 < 0$ (where H_0 is a negative constant). Then $T \leq t_* = \frac{1}{2H_0^2 c_n}$ (we are assuming $T = \sup\{t \in [0,T); D(t) \neq \emptyset\}$). Here $c_n > 0$ depends only on n and an upper bound for v in E.

The proof is based on the evolution equation and boundary condition for H (see Appendix 2: $\omega = Dw/v$):

$$L[H] = |h|_g^2 H + Hh^2(\omega,\omega) - H^2 h(\omega,\omega), \quad H_n = (\beta^2/\beta_0)Hh_{nn}.$$

Since $h^2(\omega,\omega) \geq 0$, $|h|_g^2 \geq (1/n)H^2$ and (given that $h \leq 0$) $h(\omega,\omega) \geq |Dw|^2 H$, we have:

$$L[H] \leq \frac{1}{n}H^3 + |Dw|^2 H^3 \leq c_n H^3,$$

where c_n depends on n and on $\sup_E |v|$ (already known to be finite). Let $\phi(t)$ solve the o.d.e. $\dot{\phi} = c_n\phi^3, \phi(0) = H_0$:

$$\phi(t) = H_0[1 - 2c_n H_0^2 t]^{-1/2}, \quad 0 \leq t < t_* := \frac{1}{2H_0^2 c_n}.$$

Then with $\psi := (1/n)(H^2 + H\phi + \phi^2) > 0$, setting $\chi = H - \phi$:

$$L[\chi] \leq \psi\chi \quad \text{in } E;$$

$$\chi_n = \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0}(\chi + \phi)h_{nn} \geq \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0}\chi \quad \text{on } \partial_l E$$

(since $\phi < 0$ and $h_{nn} \leq 0$). Given that $\chi \leq 0$ at $t = 0$, it follows from the maximum principle that $\chi \leq 0$, or $H \leq \phi$ in $[0, \min\{T, t_*\})$. This shows $t_* < T$ is impossible, since $\phi \to -\infty$ as $t \to t_*$.

Remark 12.1. It would be natural to try to show that a negative upper bound H_0 on the mean curvature (at $t = 0$) is preserved, at least under the assumption of concavity. Unfortunately, the evolution equation for H (under graph m.c.m.) does not lend itself to a maximum principle argument. Letting $u := H - H_0$, we have

$$L[u] = |h|_g^2 u + uh^2(\omega,\omega) - u(H + H_0)h(\omega,\omega) + H_0 Q \quad \text{in } E,$$

$$Q := |h|_g^2 + h^2(\omega,\omega) - H_0 h(\omega,\omega).$$

At a point where $u = 0$, we would need to show $L[u] \leq 0$. But it is not true that $Q \geq 0$ at such a point. ($u_n \geq 0$ does hold at boundary points.)

The exception is if $n = 2$ (under an additional condition). Let $\hat{\omega} = \omega/|\omega|_g, \tilde{\omega} = \omega^{\perp}/|\omega|_g$. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{B} = \{\hat{\omega}, \tilde{\omega}\}$ is a g-orthonormal frame at each point where $\omega \neq 0$. Then with:

$$a := h(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega}), \quad b := h(\hat{\omega}, \tilde{\omega}), \quad c := h(\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\omega}),$$

we have:

$$h^2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega}) - Hh(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega}) = a^2 + b^2 - (a+c)a = b^2 - ac = -\Delta,$$

where Δ, the determinant of the matrix of h in $\mathcal{B}$, is non-negative if $h \leq 0$. In particular:

$$h^2(\omega, \omega) - Hh(\omega, \omega) = -|\omega|_g^2 \Delta \leq 0$$

in the concave case. Now consider the expression denoted above by Q (at a point where $u = 0$, or $H = H_0$). Since $|\omega|_g^2 = |Dw|^2$:

$$Q = |h|_g^2 + h^2(\omega, \omega) - Hh(\omega, \omega) = a^2 + 2b^2 + c^2 + |Dw|^2(b^2 - ac)$$

$$= b^2(2 + |Dw|^2) + a^2 - |Dw|^2 ac + c^2,$$

so $Q \geq 0$ provided $|Dw|^2 \leq 2$. This last condition is equivalent to $v \leq \sqrt{3}$, and hence (Lemma 12.2) is preserved by the evolution if it holds at $t = 0$. Thus we have:

Proposition 12.5. *Assume $n = 2$, $h \leq 0$ and $v \leq \sqrt{3}$ on Σ_0 (in particular, $\beta \geq 1/\sqrt{3}$). Then $H \leq H_0 < 0$ at $t = 0$ implies $H \leq H_0$ for all $t \in [0, T_{max})$.*

13. Global bounds from boundary bounds for $\nabla^n h$.

In this section we begin to develop a continuation criterion for solutions of graph mean curvature motion with constant contact angle, based on the second fundamental form. Our first observation is that the supremum of $|h|_g$ on the moving boundary controls its value in the interior. Recall we already have a bound on $\sup_E v$ (Lemma 12.2); it is a well known-fact for mean curvature flow of graphs that this implies interior bounds for the second fundamental form and its covariant derivatives ([1], [2]). In the next lemma we describe a global bound for mean curvature motion of graphs with moving boundaries.

Lemma 13.1. *Let $w : E \to \mathbb{R}$ be a (sufficiently regular) solution of graph m.c.m in a spacetime domain $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]$, where $T < \infty$. Assume the first derivative bound $v(x, t) \leq \bar{v}$ holds globally in $\bar{E}$. Then if the bound*

$|h|_g \leq h_0$ holds on the parabolic boundary $\partial_p E$, we also have the global bound:

$$|h|_g \leq a_0 \quad \text{in } \bar{E},$$

for a constant a_0 depending only on $n, \bar{v}, h_0, T$ and the initial data of w.

Proof in the concave case. The proof is simpler under the assumption that h is negative-definite. (As shown in the previous section, this is preserved if it holds at $t = 0$).

Notation: In this proof, the norms of tensors in $D(t)$ are always taken with respect to the induced metric g, so we write e.g. $|h|$ for $|h|_g$, $|\nabla h|$ for $|\nabla h|_g$, and $|Df|^2 = g^{ij} f_i f_j$ for a function f.

Recall the evolution equations:

$$L[v] = -v|h|^2 - \frac{2}{v}|Dv|^2, \qquad \text{so } L[v^2] = -2v^2|h|^2 - 6|Dv|^2,$$

$$L[|h|^2] = -2|\nabla h|^2 + 2|h|^4 - 4Hh^3(\omega, \omega) - 2H|h|^2 h(\omega, \omega).$$

In the concave case, since $H \leq 0$ and h^3 is negative-definite, this implies:

$$L[|h|^2] \leq -2|\nabla h|^2 + 2|h|^4.$$

The idea of the proof is to apply the maximum principle to $f = |h|^2 v^2$. In the evolution equation for f:

$$L[f] = v^2 L[|h|^2] + |h|^2 L[v^2] - 2\langle D|h|^2, Dv^2 \rangle_g,$$

the terms $\pm 2v^2|h|^4$ cancel exactly, and we have the inequality:

$$L[f] \leq -2v^2|\nabla h|^2 - 6|h|^2|Dv|^2 - 2\langle D|h|^2, Dv^2\rangle_g.$$

The term with the inner product can be estimated in two ways:

$$|\langle D|h|^2, Dv^2\rangle_g| \leq |D|h|^2||Dv^2| \leq 4|h|v|\nabla h||Dv| \leq 2v^2|\nabla h|^2 + 2|h|^2|Dv|^2$$

and:

$$\langle D|h|^2, Dv^2\rangle_g = \frac{1}{v^2}\langle D(|h|^2 v^2), Dv^2\rangle_g - \frac{|h|^2}{v^2}|Dv^2|^2 = \frac{1}{v^2}\langle Df, Dv^2\rangle_g - 4|h|^2|Dv|^2.$$

Using the second expression, we have:

$$L[f] \leq -2v^2|\nabla h|^2 - 6|h|^2|Dv|^2 - \frac{1}{v^2}\langle Df, Dv^2\rangle_g + 4|h|^2|Dv|^2 - \langle D|h|^2, Dv^2\rangle_g,$$

and then estimating the remaining inner product term from the first expression:

$$L[f] \le -2v^2|\nabla h|^2 - 6|h|^2|Dv|^2 - \frac{1}{v^2}\langle Df, Dv^2\rangle_g + 4|h|^2|Dv|^2 + 2v^2|\nabla h|^2 + 2|h|^2|Dv|^2,$$

yielding after cancelation:

$$L[f] \le -\frac{1}{v^2}\langle Df, Dv^2\rangle_g.$$

Applying the (weak) maximum principle to f, we conclude:

$$\max_{\bar{E}} |h|^2 \le \max_{\bar{E}} f \le \max_{\partial_p E} f \le \bar{v}^2 \max_{\partial_p E} |h|^2,$$

which implies the result, with an explicit constant $a_0 = \bar{v} h_0$.

Remark. In the general (not necessarily concave) case, we have:

$$L[|h|^2] \le -2|\nabla h|^2 + c_n |h|^4.$$

Then the proof follows the same lines as that of proposition 3.21 in [2]: we apply the maximum principle to $f = |h|^2(\eta \circ v^2)$, for a carefully chosen function $\eta(s)$.

Evolution of $|\nabla h|^2$.

In the calculation that follows, we adopt the usual convention that in symbols such as:

$$\nabla^2 h * (\nabla h)^{(2)} * h^{(3)}, \quad (\nabla^j h)^{(p)} = \nabla^j h * \ldots * \nabla^j h \ (p \text{ times }) \ ,$$

$*$ denotes some unspecified g-contraction of the tensors in question.

For the time derivative, we have:

$$\partial_t |\nabla h|^2 = 2\langle \partial_t(\nabla h), \nabla h\rangle + \partial_t(g^{ij} g^{pq} g^{rs})(\nabla_i h)_{pr}(\nabla_j h)_{qs}$$
$$= 2\langle \partial_t(\nabla h), \nabla h\rangle + 3(\partial_t g^{ij})\langle \nabla_i h, \nabla_j h\rangle,$$

using the Codazzi identity.

For the Hessian (using $\nabla_k \partial_l = h_{kl}\omega$, see appendix):

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2_{k,l}|\nabla h|^2 &= 2\langle \nabla_l(\nabla_k \nabla h), \nabla h\rangle + 2\langle \nabla_k \nabla h, \nabla_l \nabla h\rangle - h_{kl} d_\omega |\nabla h|^2 \\
&= 2\langle \nabla^2_{k,l}(\nabla h), \nabla h\rangle + 2\langle h_{kl}\nabla_\omega \nabla h, \nabla h\rangle + 2\langle \nabla_k \nabla h, \nabla_l \nabla h\rangle - h_{kl} d_\omega |\nabla h|^2 \\
&= 2\langle \nabla^2_{k,l}(\nabla h), \nabla h\rangle + 2\langle \nabla_k \nabla h, \nabla_l \nabla h\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

after cancelation. Taking traces we find:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla h|^2 = -2|\nabla^2 h|^2 + 2\langle(\partial_t - \Delta)(\nabla h), \nabla h\rangle + 3(\partial_t g^{ij})\langle\nabla_i h, \nabla_j h\rangle.$$

Commutation of covariant derivatives introduces the Riemann curvature tensor, and the time derivative of the connection is also needed:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)(\nabla h) = \nabla[(\partial_t - \Delta)h] + (\nabla Rm) * h + Rm * (\nabla h) + (\partial_t \Gamma) * h,$$

where (see appendix):

$$\partial_t h = \nabla dH + H\nabla_\omega h + T + h^{(3)}, \quad T_{ij} = H_i h(\omega, \partial_j) + H_j h(\omega, \partial_i),$$

which combined with $\Gamma = h\omega$ and $\partial_t \omega = \nabla H + h^{(2)}$ is easily seen to imply:

$$\partial_t \Gamma = (\nabla dH)\omega + \nabla h * h + h^{(3)} \sim \nabla^2 h + \nabla h * h + h^{(3)}.$$

From the Gauss equation, $Rm \sim h * h$. Thus:

$$\langle(\partial_t - \Delta)(\nabla h), \nabla h\rangle \sim \langle\nabla[(\partial_t - \Delta)h], \nabla h\rangle + \nabla^2 h * \nabla h * h + (\nabla h)^{(2)} * h^{(2)} + \nabla h * h^{(4)}.$$

On the other hand, from the evolution equation for h (appendix) we have:

$$\langle\nabla[(\partial_t - \Delta)h], \nabla h\rangle = \langle\nabla(H\nabla_\omega h + T + h^{(3)}), \nabla h\rangle = \langle\nabla(H\nabla_\omega h), \nabla h\rangle + \langle\nabla T, \nabla h\rangle + (\nabla h)^{(2)} * h^{(2)}.$$

Computing the terms on the right, we find:

$$\langle\nabla(H\nabla_\omega h), \nabla h\rangle = \langle\nabla_\omega h, \nabla_{\nabla H} h\rangle + H\langle\nabla(\nabla_\omega h), \nabla h\rangle = \langle\nabla_\omega h, \nabla_{\nabla H} h\rangle + \nabla^2 h * \nabla h * h,$$

and using the Codazzi identity:

$$\langle\nabla T, \nabla h\rangle = 2\langle\nabla_\omega h, \nabla_{\nabla H} h\rangle + \nabla^2 h * \nabla h * h + (\nabla h)^{(2)} * h^{(2)}.$$

Putting together these results, we have:

$$\langle(\partial_t - \Delta)(\nabla h), \nabla h\rangle = 3\langle\nabla_\omega h, \nabla_{\nabla H} h\rangle + \nabla^2 h * \nabla h * h + (\nabla h)^{(2)} * h^{(2)} + \nabla h * h^{(4)}.$$

On the other hand, using the expression for $\partial_t g^{ij}$ given in the appendix we find:

$$3\partial_t g^{ij}\langle\nabla_i h, \nabla_j h\rangle = -6\langle\nabla_\omega h, \nabla_{\nabla H} h\rangle + (\nabla h)^{(2)} * h^{(2)}.$$

So we have a cancelation, and obtain the evolution equation:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla h|^2 = -2|\nabla^2 h|^2 + \nabla^2 h * \nabla h * h + (\nabla h)^{(2)} * h^{(2)} + \nabla h * h^{(4)}.$$

Remark: without the cancelation, the right-hand side would involve terms of type $(\nabla h)^{(3)}$, which would be a problem for the argument that follows.

Given this calculation, the following lemma has a very simple proof.

Lemma 13.2. For a solution $w \in C^{5,3}(E)$, assume we have a uniform bound for h: $|h| \leq a_0$ in E. Then we may find constants $\alpha > 0, C > 0$ depending only on the dimension and a_0, so that the function:

$$f(x,t) = \alpha|\nabla h|^2 + |h|^2$$

is a subsolution in E: $(\partial_t - \Delta)f \leq C$.

Proof. The calculation above implies:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla h|^2 \leq -2|\nabla^2 h|^2 + c_n(a_0|\nabla^2 h||\nabla h| + a_0^2|\nabla h|^2 + a_0^4|\nabla h|),$$

while the evolution equation for $|h|^2$ implies:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta h)|h|^2 \leq -2|\nabla h|^2 + c_n(a_0^2|\nabla h| + a_0^4).$$

Clearly we may choose α small enough to satisfy the claim.

Our next goal is to extend this argument to higher covariant derivatives of h. It turns out this does not involve a cancelation similar to the one noted above. The various terms T appearing in each expression below are all of the same 'weight', where the weight w of a term is the positive integer defined by:

$$w[\nabla^j h] = j+1, \quad w[(\nabla^j h)^{(p)}] = p(j+1), \quad j \geq 0, p \geq 1,$$

$$\text{If } T = (\nabla^{j_1} h)^{(p_1)} * \ldots * (\nabla^{j_r} h)^{(p_r)}, \quad w[T] = \sum_{i=1}^{r} p_i(j_i+1).$$

We introduce a convenient notation for the 'error terms'. For integers $w_0 \geq 1$ and $n \geq$, the notation $E^{w_0,n}$ is used for a generic term of weight w_0, involving covariant derivatives of h of order at most n, satisfying certain restrictions:

$$(E^{w_0,n}) \quad w[T] = w_0, \quad j_i \leq n, \quad p_i = 1 \text{ if } j_i = n, \quad p_i = 1 \text{ or } 2 \text{ if } j_i = n-1 \text{ and } n \geq 1.$$

The symbol $\tilde{E}^{w_0,n}$ denotes the larger space where we drop the restrictions:

$$(\tilde{E}^{w_0,n}) \quad w[T] = w_0, \quad j_i \leq n.$$

(Sometimes the same notation is used for the real vector space spanned by terms of the given type). For example, above we checked that:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|h|^2 = -2|\nabla h|^2 + E^{4,1},$$

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla h|^2 = -2|\nabla^2 h|^2 + E^{6,2}.$$

These symbols have some useful properties. For example, it is easy to prove by induction that:

$$\nabla(E^{n+3,n+1}) \subset E^{n+4,n+2}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

In the proof of this the following easily verified fact (for $n > 1$) is used:

$$E^{n+3,n+1} = (\nabla^{n+1}h) * h + (\nabla^n h) * [\nabla h + h^{(2)}] + \tilde{E}^{n+3,n-1}.$$

The property verified above for low n holds in general:

Lemma 13.3. For $n \geq 0$:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla^n h|^2 = -2|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 + E^{2n+4,n+1}.$$

Proof (for $n \geq 2$.) With the natural multi-index notation:

$$\partial_t|\nabla h|^2 = 2\langle \partial_t(\nabla^n h), \nabla^n h\rangle + \partial_t(g^{IJ}g^{pr}g^{qs})(\nabla^n_I h)_{pq}(\nabla^n_J h)_{rs}, \quad |I| = |J| = n,$$

where, using the Codazzi identity and the curvature tensor repeatedly:

$$\partial_t(g^{IJ}g^{pr}g^{qs})(\nabla^n_I h)_{pq}(\nabla^n_J h)_{rs} = (n+2)(\partial_t g^{ij})\langle \nabla_i \nabla^{n-1}h, \nabla_j \nabla^{n-1}h\rangle$$

$$+(\partial_t g^{ij})Rm[\nabla^{n-2}h]_i * Rm[\nabla^{n-2}h]_j + (\partial_t g^{ij})(\nabla^n h)_i * Rm[\nabla^{n-2}h]_j.$$

Recall (appendix) $\partial_t g^{ij} = \nabla h + h^{(2)}$ and $Rm = h * h$. Thus this term has the form:

$$(\nabla^n h)^{(2)} * (\nabla h + h^{(2)}) + (\nabla^{n-2}h)^{(2)} * (\nabla h + h^{(2)}) * h^{(4)} + (\nabla^n h) * (\nabla^{n-2}h) * (\nabla h + h^{(2)}) * h^{(2)},$$

so it is in $E^{2n+4,n+1}$.

Turning to space derivatives, we have (as for $n = 1$):

$$\Delta|\nabla^n h|^2 = 2\langle \Delta(\nabla^n h), \nabla^n h\rangle + 2|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2,$$

and therefore:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla^n h|^2 = -2|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 + 2\langle(\partial_t - \Delta)(\nabla^n h), \nabla^n h\rangle + E^{2n+4,n+1}.$$

Claim. $(\partial_t - \Delta)[\nabla^n h] \in E^{n+3,n+1}$ $(n \geq 0)$.

The claim clearly implies the conclusion of the lemma (bearing in mind the expression seen above for a general term in $E^{n+3,n+1}$). Of course, we prove it by induction on n, the cases $n = 0, 1$ having already been checked:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)h = H\nabla_\omega h + T + h^{(3)} \in E^{3,1}, \quad (\partial_t - \Delta)(\nabla h) = \nabla[(\partial_t - \Delta)h] + E^{4,2} \in E^{4,2}.$$

Proof of claim. The claim would follow inductively from:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)[\nabla^{n+1}h] = \nabla[(\partial_t - \Delta)(\nabla^n h)] + E^{n+4,n+2},$$

since $\nabla E^{n+3,n+1} \subset E^{n+4,n+2}$.

For the time derivative part, we have, for any multi-index iI of length $i + 1$, $|I| = n$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t[\nabla^{n+1}h]_{iI} &= \partial_t[\partial_i(\nabla^n h[\partial_I])) - (\nabla^n h)(\nabla_i \partial_I)] \\
&= \partial_i(\partial_t(\nabla^n h[\partial_I])) - \partial_t(\nabla^n h[\nabla_i \partial_I]) \qquad . \\
&= \nabla_i(\partial_t(\nabla^n h))[\partial_I] + \partial_t(\nabla^n h)(\nabla_i \partial_I) - \partial_t(\nabla^n h)(\nabla_i \partial_I) - \nabla^n h[\partial_t(\nabla_i \partial_I)].
\end{aligned}$$

For a multi-index $I = i_1 \dots i_n$ of length n, denote by I_p^k the multi-index of length n obtained from I by setting its $k^{th.}$ entry i_k equal to p. It is then clear that:

$$\partial_t(\nabla_i \partial_I) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_p (\partial_t \Gamma_{ii_k}^p)\partial_{I_p^k}.$$

In symbolic notation, the preceding calculation is summarized as:

$$\partial_t[\nabla^{n+1}h] = \nabla(\partial_t \nabla^n h) + (\nabla^n h) * (\partial_t \Gamma).$$

Since $\partial_t \Gamma \in E^{3,2}$, this says:

$$\partial_t[\nabla^{n+1}h] = \nabla(\partial_t \nabla^n h) + E^{n+4,n+2}.$$

Covariant derivatives in space may be dealt with in the usual way. Writing a multi-index I of length $n+1$ as $I = iI'$, $|I'| = n$, we have for first-order derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_k(\nabla_I^{n+1}h) = \nabla_k(\nabla_{iI'}^{n+1}h) &= \nabla_k(\nabla_i(\nabla_{I'}^n h)) - \nabla_k(\nabla^n h(\nabla_i \partial_{I'})) \\
&= \nabla_i(\nabla_k(\nabla_{I'}^n h)) - \nabla_k(\nabla^n h(\nabla_i \partial_{I'})) + Rm_{ik}[\nabla_{I'}^n h].
\end{aligned}$$

And for second-order covariant derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_l(\nabla_k(\quad \nabla_I^{n+1}h)) &= \nabla_l(\nabla_i(\nabla_k(\nabla_{I'}^n h))) + \nabla_l(Rm_{ik}[\nabla_{I'}^n h]) - \nabla_l(\nabla_k(\nabla^n h(\nabla_i \partial_{I'}))) \\
&= \nabla_i(\nabla_l(\nabla_k(\nabla_{I'}^n h))) + Rm_{il}[\nabla_k(\nabla_{I'}^n h)] + \nabla(Rm * \nabla^n h) + \nabla^2(\nabla^n h * h) \\
&= \nabla_i(\nabla_{l,k}^2(\nabla_{I'}^n h)) + \nabla_i(\nabla_{\nabla_l \partial_k} \nabla_{I'}^n h) + Rm * \nabla^{n+1}h + \nabla(Rm * \nabla^n h) + \nabla^2(\nabla^n h * h).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2_{l,k}(\nabla^{n+1}_I h) \; &= \nabla_i(\nabla^2_{l,k}(\nabla^n_{I'}h)) - \nabla_{\nabla_l\partial_k}(\nabla^{n+1}_I h) + \nabla(\Gamma * \nabla^{n+1}h)\\ &+Rm * \nabla^{n+1}h + \nabla(Rm * \nabla^n h) + \nabla^2(\nabla^n h * h)\\ &= \nabla_i(\nabla^2_{l,k}(\nabla^n_{I'}h)) + \Gamma * \nabla^{n+2}h + \nabla(\Gamma * \nabla^{n+1}h)\\ &+Rm * \nabla^{n+1}h + \nabla(Rm * \nabla^n h) + \nabla^2(\nabla^n h * h).\end{aligned}$$

Taking traces with g^{kl} and using

$$Rm = h^{(2)}, \quad \nabla Rm = \nabla h * h, \quad \Gamma = h\omega, \quad \nabla\Gamma = \nabla h + h^{(2)},$$

it follows easily that:

$$\Delta(\nabla^{n+1}h) = \nabla(\Delta(\nabla^n h)) + E^{n+4,n+2},$$

and therefore:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)[\nabla^{n+1}h] = \nabla[(\partial_t - \Delta)(\nabla^n h)] + E^{n+4,n+2},$$

proving the claim and the lemma.

The analogue of Lemma 13.2 for higher covariant derivatives of h follows easily from these remarks.

Lemma 13.4. For a solution $w \in C^{n+5,[\frac{n+5}{2}]+1}(E)$, assume we have a uniform bound for h and its first n covariant derivatives: $|\nabla^j h| \leq a_j$ in E, $j = 0, \ldots, n$. Then we may find constants $\alpha > 0, C > 0$ depending only on the dimension and the a_j, so that the function:

$$f_{n+1}(x,t) = \alpha|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 + |\nabla^n h|^2$$

is a subsolution in E: $(\partial_t - \Delta)f_{n+1} \leq C$.

Proof. In the proof we denote by C_n a generic positive constant depending only on dimension and the $a_j, j = 0, \ldots, n$. We have:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla^n h|^2 = -2|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 + E^{2n+4,n+1}, \quad (\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 = -2|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 + E^{2n+6,n+2},$$

where:

$$E^{2n+4,n+1} = \nabla^{n+1}h * \nabla^n h * h + (\nabla^n h)^{(2)} * \tilde{E}^{2,1} + (\nabla^n h) * \tilde{E}^{n+3,n-1} + \tilde{E}^{2n+4,n-1},$$

$$E^{2n+6,n+2} = \nabla^{n+2}h * \nabla^{n+1}h * h + (\nabla^{n+1}h)^{(2)} * \tilde{E}^{2,1} + (\nabla^{n+1}h) * \tilde{E}^{n+4,n} + \tilde{E}^{2n+6,n}.$$

This implies:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla^n h|^2 \leq -2|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 + C_n|\nabla^{n+1}h| + C_n,$$

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 \leq -2|\nabla^{n+2}h|^2 + C_n|\nabla^{n+2}h||\nabla^{n+1}h| + C_n(|\nabla^{n+1}h|^2 + |\nabla^{n+1}h| + 1).$$

It is easy to see from these inequalities that we may choose α sufficiently small so that the conclusion of the lemma will hold.

14. Hölder gradient estimate for the second fundamental form.

Notational remark: In this section, parabolic Hölder spaces are denoted by a single superscript (that is, the space previously denoted $C^{2+\alpha,(1+\alpha)/2}$ is denoted $C^{2+\alpha}$ in this section). Capital X, Y etc. denote general points in the spacetime domain E. (This follows the notation used in [8].)

A continuation criterion for the solution $w(y,t)$ in E^T in terms of a bound on the norm $|h|_g$ of the second fundamental form would follow from an a-priori $C^{3+\delta}(E^T)$ bound on a solution, assuming $|h|_g \leq a_0$ in $\bar{E}^T$; equivalently, from a global a priori Hölder gradient bound $|\nabla h|_\delta \leq M$ in $\bar{E}^T$ (for suitably controlled M). In this section we show how such a bound follows from the a-priori estimates of linear parabolic theory applied to the evolution equations for v, H, and the Weingarten operator, under an additional hypothesis.

Assuming $w \in C^{2+\delta}(E^T)$ is a solution, satisfying in addition $|h|_g \leq a_0$ in E^T, we already observed the maximum principle implies bounds:

$$0 \leq w \leq w_0, \quad 1 \leq v \leq \bar{v} \text{ in } \bar{E}^T,$$

depending only on the initial data and β (we assume $w \geq 0$, at $t = 0$, vanishing only on ∂D_0.) In particular, g is uniformly equivalent to the euclidean metric on E^T. In this section, bounds depending on a_0, $\bar{v}$ and the initial data will be denoted generically by a constant $M > 0$ (dependence on β will not be recorded explicitly). The bound on h implies a uniform C^2 bound for the spacetime domain E^T, which we can express in terms of a diffeomorphism $\Phi : D_0 \times [0,T] \to E^T$ by:

$$|\Phi|_{C^2} \leq M.$$

We will also need to assume a uniform gradient bound on the boundary for the second fundamental form:

$$|(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau,\tau)| \leq a_1 \quad \forall \tau \in T\partial D(t), |\tau| = 1.$$

Estimates depending a_0, a_1, $\bar{v}$ and the initial data will be given in terms of constants denoted generically by M_1.

In fact E^T is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ of class $C^{2+\delta}$, with bounds controlled by M_1. (This statement includes some regularity in t, so it is not immediate from the uniform bound assumed for $\nabla^{tan}h^{tan}$ on $\partial_l E$). To see this, consider the equation satisfied by $w_k = \partial_k w$, written in 'divergence form' with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w_k - \partial_i(g^{ij}\partial_j w_k) = g^k := (\partial_k g^{ij})w_{ij} - (\partial_i g^{ij})\partial_j w_k \\ w_{k|\partial_l E} := \varphi^k = (\beta_0/\beta)n^k, \quad w_{k|t=0} = \partial_k w_0 \end{cases}$$

Assuming $\partial_k w \in C^{1+\delta}(E)$, the following estimate holds ([8], thm 4.27):

$$|w_k|_{1+\delta} \leq C(\sup_E |w_k| + ||g^k||_{1,n+1+\delta} + |\varphi^k|_{1+\delta;\partial_l E} + |\partial_k w_0|_{1+\delta;D_0}).$$

Here $||g^k||_{1,n+1+\delta}$ is the norm in the spacetime Morrey space $L^{1,n+1+\delta}(E)$:

$$||g^k||_{1,n+1+\delta} = \sup_{Y\in E, r<diam(E)} (r^{-(n+1+\delta)} \int_{E[Y,r]} |g^n| dX).$$

In the present case this can easily be estimated, since:

$$|\partial_k g^{ij}| = |h^i_k \omega^j + h^j_k \omega^i| \leq M, \quad |\partial_j w_k| \leq \bar{v} a_0 \leq M \Rightarrow |g^k| \leq M,$$

and $|E[Y,r]| \leq Cr^{n+2}$, while $\delta \in (0,1)$. Thus $||g^k||_{1,n+1+\delta} \leq M$.

Since $|\nabla_\tau(\nabla_\tau n)| \leq c(|(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau,\tau)| + |h|) \leq M_1$, it follows that n is C^2 in space variables on $\partial_l E$. On the other hand, $Dw = \omega/\beta$ on $\partial D(t)$, and ω is a solution of $\partial_t \omega^k = tr_g D^2\omega^k + |h|^2_g \omega^k$, hence n is also C^1 in time on $\partial_l E$. We conclude $|\varphi^k|_{1+\delta;\partial_l E} \leq (\beta_0/\beta)|n|_{1+\delta;\partial_l E} \leq M_1$.

Therefore we have $|Dw|_{1+\delta} \leq M_1$, and $|w|_{2+\delta} \leq M_1$ (note that C depends on $|g^{ij}|_{C^\delta}$ and other constants also controlled by M.) In particular, E^T is a $C^{2+\delta}$ domain with chart constants controlled by M_1. (In fact, in a neighborhood of any point $P \in \partial_l E$ with $\partial_{y_2} w \neq 0$, a boundary chart Ψ is given by $\Psi(y_1, y_2, t) = (y_1, w(y,t), t)$.)

The first-order term in the evolution equation for h (or for the Weingarten operator) involves DH; hence the next step is to obtain a global gradient bound $|DH|_{1+\alpha} \leq M_1$ in $\bar{E}^T$. The mean curvature satisfies the 'divergence form' equation with Neumann boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t H - \partial_j(g^{ij}(X)H_i) + \partial_j(g^{ij})(X)\partial_i H - c(X)H = 0, \\ d_n H = (\beta^2/\beta_0)Hh_{nn} := \psi \text{ on } \partial D(t), \quad H_{|t=0} = H_0, \end{cases}$$

where:

$$c := |h|^2_g - h^2(\omega,\omega) + Hh(\omega,\omega).$$

Then, with the regularity conditions for the domain and the coefficients:

$$\partial_l E \in C^{1+\delta}, \quad n \in C^{\delta}(\partial_l E), \quad \partial_j(g^{ij}) \in L^{1,n+1+\delta}(E), \quad c \in L^{1,n+1+\delta}(E),$$

and assuming $H \in C^{1+\delta}(E)$, or $w \in C^{3+\delta}(E)$, we have the bound:

$$|H|_{1+\delta;\bar{E}} \leq C(\sup_E |H| + |\psi|_{\delta;\partial_l E} + |H_0|_{1+\delta;D_0}).$$

As noted earlier:

$$||\partial_j g^{ij}||_{1,n+1+\delta} + ||c||_{1,n+1+\delta} \leq M,$$

hence C is controlled by M. In addition, $|w|_{2+\delta} \leq M_1$ implies $|h|_\delta \leq M_1$, and hence: $|\psi|_{\delta;\partial_l E} \leq M_1$. We conclude $|H|_{1+\delta} \leq M_1$, and state it as a lemma.

Lemma 14.1. Let $w \in C^{3+\delta}(E^T)$ be a classical solution of graph mean curvature motion, with contact and constant-angle boundary conditions. Assume (i) $|h|_g \leq a_0$ on $\partial_l E$; (ii) $|(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau,\tau)| \leq a_1$ on $\partial_l E$. Then we have the global gradient bound for H:

$$\sup_{\bar{E}^T} |DH|_\delta \leq M_1,$$

for a constant M_1 depending on $\delta, \bar{v}, a_0, a_1$ and the initial data w_0.

Corollary 14.2. Under the same hypotheses as Lemma 14.1, we have a global gradient bound:

$$\sup_{\bar{E}} |\nabla h|_g \leq M_1,$$

for a positive constant M_1 depending on $\delta, \bar{v}, a_0, a_1$ and the initial data w_0.

Proof. The bound on the components $(\nabla_n h)(\tau,\tau)$ and $(\nabla_n h)(n,n)$ on the lateral boundary $\partial_l E$ follows immediately from the expressions in section 11. The bound on $(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau,\tau)$ over $\partial_l E$ is hypothesized, and then the bound on the remaining component $(\nabla_\tau h)(n,n)$ follows from the global gradient bound $|DH| \leq M$ implied by Lemma 14.1. Thus $|\nabla h| \leq M_1$ on $\partial_l E$, and then the global bound follows from Lemma 13.2 and the maximum principle.

To improve the conclusion of corollary 14.2 to a Hölder gradient bound, it is natural to consider the evolution equation for h, with the Neumann-type boundary conditions derived in section 11. One is then faced with the problem that those boundary conditions do not control components such as

$(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau,\tau)$ on $\partial_t E$. So as a preliminary step we consider the evolution equation for v, which has the advantage that the boundary values are constant. Written in linear form, we have:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v - g^{ij}(X)v_{ij} + b^i(X)\partial_i v + c(X)v = 0 \\ v_{|\partial_t E} = \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad v_{|t=0} = v_0, \end{cases}$$

where:

$$g^{ij}(X) = \delta_{ij} - \frac{w_i w_j}{1+|Dw|^2}(X), \quad b^i(X) = \frac{2g^{ij}w_k w_{kj}}{1+|Dw|^2}(X), \quad c(X) = |h|_g^2(X).$$

We clearly have $g^{ij} \in C^\delta$ (since $Dw \in C^\delta$), as well as $b^i, c \in C^\delta$ (since $h \in C^\delta$) and $\partial_l E \in C^{2+\delta}$, with bounds controlled by M_1 in all cases as observed earlier. Therefore assuming $v \in C^{2+\delta}$ (equivalently, $w \in C^{3+\delta}$) we have the bound:

$$|v|_{2+\delta;\bar{E}} \leq C(\sup_E v + \frac{1}{\beta}),$$

with C controlled by M_1. Thus $|D^2 v|_\delta \leq M_1$. Recalling $v^{-1}\partial_i v = h(\partial_i, \omega)$, this implies:

$$|(\nabla_\tau h)(n,n)|_{\delta;\partial_l E} = |(\nabla_n h)(\tau,n)|_{\delta;\partial_l E} \leq M_1, \quad \forall \tau \in T\partial D(t), |\tau| = 1.$$

Since $H = \beta^2 h_{nn} + h(\tau,\tau)$ on $\partial_l E$, it follows from Lemma 14.1 that we also have $|(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau,\tau)|_{\delta;\partial_l E} \leq M_1$. For the remaining components of ∇h, this bound follows directly from the boundary conditions:

$$|(\nabla_n h)(\tau,\tau)|_{\delta;\partial_l E} + |(\nabla_n h)(n,n)|_{\delta;\partial_l E} \leq M_1.$$

Now consider the evolution of the components of the Weingarten operator, written in divergence form with Neumann boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t h_j^k - \partial_i(g^{il}\partial_l h_j^k) = f_j^k, \text{ in } E^T, \quad f_j^k := H_j h_l^k \omega^l - H_l h_j^l \omega^k + h_j^{(3)k} - (\partial_i g^{il})(\partial_l h_j^k) \\ d_n(h_j^k) = \varphi_j^k \text{ on } \partial_l E, \quad h^k_{j\,|t=0} = h^k_{j0} \end{cases}$$

The same theorem quoted above gives the estimate (assuming $h_j^k \in C^{1+\delta}$, or $w \in C^{3+\delta}$):

$$|h_j^k|_{1+\delta;\bar{E}} \leq C(\sup_E |h_j^k| + ||f_j^k||_{1,n+1+\delta} + |\varphi_j^k|_{\delta;\partial_l E} + |h_{0j}^k|_{1+\delta;D_0}).$$

Note that:

$$d_n(h^k_j) = g^{ik}(\nabla_n h)_{ij} = \beta^2(\nabla_n h)(n, \partial_j)n^k + (\nabla_n h)(\tau, \partial_j)\tau^k \text{ on } \partial_l E.$$

From this and the above discussion it follows that $|\varphi^k_j|_{\delta;\partial_l E} \leq M_1$. The bound $||f^k_j||_{1,n+1+\delta} \leq M_1$ follows from Lemma 14.1 and Corollary 14.2. We conclude $|h^k_j|_{1+\delta;\bar{E}} \leq M_1$. The $1+\delta$ estimate for h^k_j clearly implies the following lemma.

Lemma 14.3. Let $w \in C^{3+\delta}(E^T)$ be a classical solution of graph mean curvature motion, with contact and constant-angle boundary conditions. Assume (i) $|h|_g \leq a_0$ on $\partial_l E$;(ii)$|(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau, \tau)|_{\partial_l E} \leq a_1$. Then we have the global Hölder gradient bound for h:

$$|\nabla h|_{\delta;\bar{E}^T} \leq M_1,$$

for a constant M_1 depending on $\delta, \bar{v}, a_0, a_1$ and the initial data w_0.

Remark. This is clearly equivalent to a global ‘a priori’ $C^{3+\delta}$ bound for w on $\bar{E}^T$, $|w|_{3+\delta} \leq M_1$.

Lemma 14.3 is the main step in the derivation of a ‘continuation criterion’ for this flow.

Proposition 14.4. Assume the maximal existence time T_{max} is finite. Then (for $n = 2$, in the concave case):

$$\limsup_{t \to T_{max}} \sup_{\partial D(t)} (|h|_g + |(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau, \tau)|) = \infty.$$

Proof. For $w_0 \in C^{3+\bar{\alpha}}(D_0)$ satisfying the contact angle condition (with $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ arbitrary) and $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}^2$, Theorem 8.1 yields a unique solution $F = [u, \varphi]$ of m.c.m. with contact angle/orthogonality boundary conditions in a maximal time interval $[0, T_{max}]$, with $F \in C^{2+\alpha}(Q_0^{T_{max}})$, $Q_0^{T_{max}} = Q \times [0, T_{max})$; this is also the unique solution in $F \in C^{2+\delta^2}(Q_0^{T_{max}})$, where $\delta = \alpha^2$. Then $w = u \circ \varphi^{-1} \in C^{2+\delta}(E^{T_{max}})$ is a solution of graph m.c.m., which for any $t_0 > 0$ is in $C^{3+\delta}(E_{t_0}^{T_{max}})$. By contradiction, assume $|h|_g + |(\nabla_\tau h)(\tau, \tau)|$ is bounded in $E^T_{t_0}$ for any $T < T_{max}$ (with bound independent of T). Then lemma 14.3 applies, giving an a-priori bound $|\nabla h|_{\delta;\bar{E}^T_{t_0}} \leq M_1$, for T arbitrarily close to T_{max}. In particular, $|w(\cdot, T)|_{C^{3+\delta}(D(T))} \leq M_1$, and for T sufficiently close to T_{max} we can use theorem 8.1 again (with initial data $w(\cdot, T)$) to find a solution $F' = [u', \varphi'] \in C^{2+\delta^2}(Q_0^{T'})$ (where $T' > T_{max}$), extending F. This contradicts the maximality of T_{max}.

15. Behavior at the extinction time.

In this section we consider the behavior of Σ_t as t approaches the maximal existence time T, in the concave case. We also assume $H \leq H_0 < 0$ at $t = 0$, so T is finite. Let $K_t \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be the compact convex set bounded by Σ_t. Since $H \leq 0$, $\{K_t\}$ is a decreasing family, and the intersection:

$$K_T = \bigcap_{0 \leq t < T} K_t \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

is compact, convex and non-empty. It turns out K_T has zero $(n+1)$-volume. In this section we use the support function to show this when $n = 2$ (following the argument in [13]), under the assumption that there is no 'gradient breakdown'.

Assume the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a point of K_T. The support function of K_t (with respect to this origin) is the function $p(\cdot, t)$ on $D(t)$:

$$p(y,t) = \langle G(y,t), N(y,t) \rangle, \quad G(y,t) = [y, w(y,t)].$$

Since K_t is convex, $p > 0$ in $D(t)$; the evolution equations and boundary conditions for p are easily computed: from $L[G] = 0$ and $L[N] = |h|_g^2 N$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} L[p] &= \langle L[G], N \rangle + \langle G, L[N] \rangle - 2g^{kl} \langle \partial_k G, \partial_l N \rangle \\ &= |h|_g^2 p + 2H, \end{aligned}$$

and since $\langle d_n G, N \rangle = 0$:

$$p_{n|\partial D(t)} = \langle G, d_n N \rangle = -A(G^T, N),$$

where, with $y^T := y - (y \cdot n)n \in T_y \partial D(t)$, the tangential component $G^T := G - \langle G, N \rangle N$ is easily seen to be, at $\partial D(t)$:

$$G^T = \frac{1}{v^2} [w_n^2 y^T + y, 0].$$

Since $h(y^T, n) = 0$ at $\partial D(t)$, this implies $A(G^T, n) = \beta^2 (y \cdot n) h(n,n)$. Note that $p(y) = -\beta_0 (y \cdot n)$ on $\partial D(t)$, so we have:

$$p_{n|\partial D(t)} = \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0} p h_{nn},$$

reminiscent of the boundary condition for H. Note also that we have the upper bound:

$$p \leq ||G|| \leq \max_{D(0)} ||G_0|| := p_0,$$

since the K_t are ‘nested’.

Proposition 15.1 ($n = 2$) Assume we know that

$$\limsup_{t \to T} (\sup_{y \in \partial D(t)} |h|_g) = \infty$$

at the maximal existence time T. Then:

$$\liminf_{t \to T} (\inf_{y \in D(t)} p(y,t)) = 0.$$

Proof. Reasoning by contradiction, assume $p > 2\delta > 0$ for $t \in [0, T)$. We claim that this implies an upper bound for $|H|$ (and hence for $|h|$, since $|h|^2 \leq nH^2$), contradicting the fact that $\limsup_{t \to T} \sup_{\Gamma_t} |h| = \infty$.

To prove the claim, consider the function:

$$f(y,t) := \frac{|H|}{p - \delta} = -\frac{H}{p - \delta}.$$

Using the evolution equations and boundary conditions for H and p we find (with $\hat{\omega} := \omega / |\omega|_g$, see Remark 15.1 below):

$$L[f] = f(-\delta |h|_g^2 + 2pf + |\omega|_g^2 (h^2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega}) - Hh(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega})) - \frac{2}{p - \delta} g^{kl} \partial_k f \partial_l p,$$

$$f_{n|\partial D(t)} = -\delta \frac{\beta^2}{\beta_0} h_{nn} \frac{|h|^2}{(p - \delta)^2} \geq 0.$$

Since $h|_g^2 \geq (1/n)H^2 = (1/n)f^2(p - \delta)^2$:

$$L[f] \leq -\frac{(p - \delta)^2 \delta}{n} f^2 + 2pf + |\omega|_g^2 (h^2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega}) - Hh(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega})) - \frac{2}{p - \delta} \langle \nabla f, \nabla p \rangle_g.$$

Now recall (Remark 12.1) that if $n = 2$:

$$h^2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega}) - Hh(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega}) = -\Delta \leq 0,$$

so:

$$L[f] \leq f(-\frac{(p - \delta)^2 \delta}{n} f^2 + 2pf) - \frac{2}{p - \delta} \langle \nabla f, \nabla p \rangle_g.$$

Assume $\delta > 0$ is so small that $\sup_{D(0)} f_{|t=0} < \frac{2np_0}{\delta^3}$. We claim this persists for all $t \in [0, T)$. If not, assume $f(y_0, t_0) = 2np_0/\delta^3$, with $t_0 > 0$ smallest possible and y_0 a local max of $f(\cdot, t_0)$. Since $f_n \geq 0$ at $\partial D(t_0)$, $z_0 = (y_0, t_0)$ can't be a boundary point of E (by the boundary point lemma). Since $y_0 \in \partial D(t_0)$ is an interior point, we have $L[f]_{|z_0} \geq 0$ and $\nabla f(z_0) = 0$, hence:

$$\frac{(p-\delta)^2\delta}{n} f(z_0) \leq 2p(z_0), \text{ or } f(z_0) \leq \frac{2np(z_0)}{\delta(p-\delta)^2} \leq \frac{2np_0}{\delta(p-\delta)^2},$$

which is not possible since $p - \delta > \delta$. Thus $f(y,t) < 4p_0/\delta^3$ in E, which implies the bound:

$$|H| \leq \frac{4p_0^2}{\delta^3}$$

for $t \in [0, T)$, contradicting the maximality of T.

Remark 15.1. Consider the vector fields in $D(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$\omega = \frac{1}{v}[w_1, w_2], \quad \tilde{\omega} = v\omega^\perp = [-w_2, w_1].$$

It is easy to verify the following:

$$\langle \omega, \tilde{\omega} \rangle_g = 0, \quad |\omega|_g^2 = |\tilde{\omega}|_g^2 = |Dw|_e^2 := w_1^2 + w_2^2.$$

Thus we may think of $\{\omega, \tilde{\omega}\}$ as a 'conformal pseudo-frame' (ω and $\tilde{\omega}$ vanish when $Dw = 0$), defined on all of $D(t)$. Moreover, at the boundary $\partial D(t)$:

$$\omega = \beta_0 n, \quad \tilde{\omega} = \frac{\beta_0}{\beta} n^\perp := \frac{\beta_0}{\beta}\tau,$$

where $\{\tau, n\}$ is an euclidean-orthonormal frame along Γ_t. Thus ω and $\tilde{\omega}$ supply 'canonical' extensions of n, τ to the interior of $D(t)$, as uniformly bounded vector fields.

Remark 15.2. It follows from the proposition that K_T cannot contain a half-ball of positive radius centered at a point of $\mathbb{R}^2$; in particular, $vol_3(K_T) = 0$. Based on the experience with curve networks [7], one is led to expect that K_T is a point (that is, that $diam(K_T) = 0$), at least under the same assumption as the proposition ('no gradient breakdown'). We have not been able to show this yet; existence of self-similar solutions and comparison arguments appropriate to the free-boundary setting appear to be needed for the usual approach to work.

16. Final comments.

1. We state here the local existence theorem for configurations of graphs over domains with moving boundaries. In this setting, a *triple junction configuration* consists of three embedded hypersurfaces $\Sigma^1, \Sigma^2, \Sigma^3$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, graphs of functions w^I defined over time-dependent domains $D^1(t), D^2(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (D^1 covered by one graph, D^2 by two graphs), satisfying the following conditions: (1) The Σ^I intersect along an $(n-1)$-dimensional graph $\Lambda(t)$ (the 'junction'), along which the upward unit normals satisfy the relation: $N_1 + N_2 = N_3$. (2) If a fixed support hypersurface $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is given (also a graph, not necessarily connected), the Σ^I intersect S orthogonally.

Topologically, in the case of bounded domains one has the following examples: (i) ('lens' type) 2 disks (or two annuli) covering $D^2(t)$ and one annulus covering $D^1(t)$; (ii) ('exterior' type) two annuli covering $D^2(t)$ and one disk covering $D^1(t)$. The boundary component of the annuli disjoint from the junction intersects the support hypersurface S orthogonally for each t.

Let Σ_0^I ($I = 1, 2, 3$) be graphs of $C^{3+\alpha}$ functions over $C^{3+\alpha}$ domains $D_0^1, D_0^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, defining a triple junction configuration and satisfying the compatibility condition for the mean curvatures on the common boundary Γ_0 of D_0^1 and D_0^2:

$$H^1 + H^2 = H^3.$$

Then there exists $T > 0$ depending only on the initial data, and functions $w^I \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\alpha/2}(Q^I)$, $Q^I \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T)$, so that the graphs of $w^I(., t) : D^I(t) \to \mathbb{R}$ define a triple junction configuration for each $t \in [0, T)$, moving by mean curvature.

The proof will be given elsewhere.

2. An interesting issue we have not addressed here is whether one has breakdown of uniqueness for initial data of lower regularity, or if the 'orthogonality condition' at the junction is removed. For curve networks, non-uniqueness has been considered in [11]; but neither a drop in regularity (from initial data to solution, in Hölder spaces) nor the orthogonality condition play a role in the case of curves.

Appendix 1: **Proof of lemma 4.1.**

Throughout the proof, n denotes the inner unit normal at ∂D, extended to a tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ so that $D_n n = 0$. Since D is uniformly $C^{3+\alpha}$, if follows that $n \in C^{2+\alpha}(\partial D)$, with uniform bounds. Denote by ρ the distance to the boundary (so $D\rho = n$ in $\mathcal{N}$). Let $\zeta \in C^3(\bar{D})$ be a cutoff function, with $\zeta \equiv 1$ in $\mathcal{N}_1 \subset \mathcal{N}$, $\zeta \equiv 0$ in $D \setminus \mathcal{N}$.

We find φ of the form:

$$\varphi(x) = x + \zeta(x)f(x)n(x)$$

with $f \in C^{2+\alpha}(\mathcal{N})$. The 1-jet conditions on φ at ∂D translate to the conditions on f:

$$f_{|\partial D} = 0, \quad Df_{|\partial D} = 0, \quad D^2 f(n,n)_{|\partial D} = \Delta f_{|\partial D} = h.$$

Now use:

Lemma A.1. Let D be a uniformly $C^{3+\alpha}$ domain with boundary distance function $\rho > 0$. Let $h \in C^\alpha(\partial D)$ be a bounded function. Then there exists an extension $g \in C^\infty(D) \cap C(\bar{D})$ so that $g_{|\partial D} = h$, $\sup_{\bar{D}} |g| \leq \sup_{\partial D} |h|$ and $\rho^2 g \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{D})$.

Given this lemma, all we have to do is set $f = (1/2)\rho^2 g$, which clearly satisfies all the requirements (in particular, $\Delta f = h$ at ∂D.)

To verify that φ is a diffeomorphism, it suffices to check that $|\zeta f n|_{C^1}$ (in $\mathcal{N} \subset \{\rho < \rho_0\}$) is small if ρ_0 is small. This is easily seen:

$$|\zeta f n|_{C^0} \leq (1/2)\rho_0^2 |g|_{C^0};$$
$$|D\zeta| \leq c\rho_0^{-1} \Rightarrow |fD\zeta| \leq c\rho_0 |g|_{C^0}.$$
$$|Df| \leq (1/2)\rho_0^\alpha ||g||_{C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{D})}$$

on $\mathcal{N}$, since $Df \in C^{1+\alpha}(\bar{D})$ and $Df_{|\partial D} = 0$. And finally, with $\mathcal{A}$ the second fundamental form of ∂D:

$$|Dn| \leq |\mathcal{A}|_{C^0} \Rightarrow |fDn| \leq (1/2)\rho_0^2 |g|_{C^0} |\mathcal{A}|_{C^0}.$$

A word about Lemma A.1. (This is probably in the literature, but I don't know a reference.) If D is the upper half-space, we solve $\Delta g = 0$ in D with boundary values h. Then the estimate

$$[D^2(\rho^2 P * h)]^{(\alpha)}(\bar{D}) \leq c|h|_{C^\alpha(\partial D)}$$

follows by direct computation with the Poisson kernel P; for the rest of the norm, use interpolation. Then transfer the estimate to a general domain using 'adapted local charts', in which ρ in D corresponds to the vertical coordinate in the upper half-space. (It is easy to see that at each boundary point there is a $C^{2+\alpha}$ adapted chart, with uniform bounds.)

Appendix 2: Evolution equations for the second fundamental form.

We consider mean curvature motion of graphs:

$$G(y,t) = [y, w(y,t)], \quad y \in D(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$w_t = g^{ij} w_{ij} = vH, \quad v = \sqrt{1 + |Dw|^2}.$$

In this appendix we include evolution equations for geometric quantities, in terms of the operators:

$$\partial_t - \Delta_g, \qquad L = \partial_t - tr_g d^2.$$

It is often convenient to use the vector field in $D(t)$:

$$\omega := \frac{1}{v} Dw.$$

Since $-\omega$ is the $\mathbb{R}^n$ component of the unit normal N and $L[N] = |h|_g^2 N$, we have:

$$L[\omega^i] = |h|_g^2 \omega^i, \quad |h|_g^2 := g^{ik} g^{jl} h_{ij} h_{kl}.$$

Here $h = (h_{ij})$ is the pullback to $D(t)$ of the second fundamental form A:

$$h(\partial_i, \partial_j) = h_{ij} = A(G_i, G_j) = \frac{1}{v} w_{ij}.$$

First, denoting by ∇ the pullback to $D(t)$ of the induced connection ∇^Σ (that is, $G_*(\nabla_X Y) = \nabla^\Sigma_{G_* X} G_* Y$ for any vector fields X, Y in $D(t)$), and using the definition:

$$\nabla^\Sigma_{G_i} G_j = G_{ij} - \langle G_{ij}, N \rangle N = [0, w_{ij}] - \frac{1}{v^2} w_{ij} [-Dw, 1] = \frac{w_{ij}}{v^2} [Dw, |Dw|^2] = \frac{w_{ij}}{v^2} G_* Dw,$$

we conclude:

$$\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_j = \frac{1}{v} h_{ij} Dw = h_{ij} \omega.$$

From this one derives easily a useful expression relating the Laplace-Beltrami operator and the operator $tr_g d^2$ acting on functions:

$$\Delta_g f = tr_g d^2 f - \frac{H}{v} w_m f_m = tr_g d^2 f - H d_\omega f.$$

We also have, for the covariant derivatives of h with respect to the euclidean connection and to $\nabla = \nabla^g$:

$$\partial_m (h_{ij}) = \nabla_m h_{ij} + [h_{jm} h_{ik} + h_{im} h_{jk}] \omega^k.$$

(Here ∇h is the symmetric $(3,0)$-tensor with components: $\nabla_m h_{ij} = (\nabla_{\partial_m} h)(\partial_i, \partial_j)$.)

Iterating this and taking g-traces yields (using the Codazzi identity and the easily verified relation $\partial_i \omega^k = h_i^k := g^{jk} h_{ij}$):

$$tr_g d^2(h_{ij}) = g^{mk}\partial_m(\partial_k(h_{ij})) = g^{mk}(\nabla^2_{\partial_m,\partial_k} h)(\partial_i, \partial_j)$$

$$+H\nabla_\omega h_{ij} + 2[h_i^k \nabla_k h_{jp} + h_j^k \nabla_k h_{ip}]\omega^p + [H_i h_{jp} + H_j h_{ip}]\omega^p$$

$$+2[h_{ip}(h^2)_{jq} + (h^2)_{ip} h_{jq} + H h_{ip} h_{jq}]\omega^p \omega^q + 2(h^3)_{ij} + 2(h^2)_{ij} h(\omega, \omega).$$

Here the powers h^2 and h^3 of h are the symmetric 2-tensors defined used the metric:

$$(h^2)_{ij} := g^{kp} h_{ik} h_{pj} = h_i^k h_{pj}, \quad (h^3)_{ij} := g^{kp} g^{lq} h_{ik} h_{pl} h_{qj}.$$

Note also that:

$$[h_i^k \nabla_k h_{jp} + h_j^k \nabla_k h_{ip}]\omega^p = \nabla_\omega (h^2)_{ij},$$

using the Codazzi identity.

Evolution equations for h.

Starting from $G_t = vHe_{n+1} = H(N + \frac{1}{v}[Dw, |Dw|^2]) = HN + HG_*\omega$ and $N_t = -\nabla^\Sigma H - Hv^{-1}\nabla^\Sigma v$ (where $\nabla^\Sigma f = g^{ij} f_j G_i$ and $\nabla f = g^{ij} f_j \partial_i$) we have:

$$\partial_t(h_{ij}) = \langle (HN)_{ij}, N\rangle - \langle G_{ij}, \nabla^\Sigma H\rangle - \frac{H}{v}\langle G_{ij}, \nabla^\Sigma v\rangle + \langle (HG_*\omega)_{ij}, N\rangle.$$

Using the easily derived facts:

$$\langle N_{ij}, N\rangle = -h^2(\partial_i, \partial_j),$$

$$H_{ij} - \langle G_{ij}, \nabla^\Sigma H\rangle = (\nabla dH)(\partial_i, \partial_j),$$

$$\frac{1}{v}\langle G_{ij}, \nabla^\Sigma v\rangle = h(\omega, \omega) h_{ij},$$

we obtain:

$$\partial_t(h_{ij}) = (\nabla dH)(\partial_i, \partial_j) - Hh^2(\partial_i, \partial_j) - Hh(\omega, \omega)h_{ij} + \langle (HG_*\omega)_{ij}, N\rangle,$$

where:

$$\langle (HG_*\omega)_{ij}, N\rangle = H_i \langle (G_*\omega)_j, N\rangle + H_j \langle (G_*\omega)_i, N\rangle + H\langle (G_*\omega)_{ij}, N\rangle.$$

To identify the terms, computation shows that:

$$\langle (G_*\omega)_i, N\rangle = h(\omega, \partial_i),$$

and hence, using also:

$$\nabla^{\Sigma}_{G_i}(G_*\omega) = G_*(\nabla_{\partial_i}\omega), \quad \nabla_{\partial_i}\omega = (h_i^p + \omega^q h_{iq}\omega^p)\partial_p = \sum_p h_{ip}\partial_p,$$

we obtain (using $\omega^k\partial_j(h_{ik}) = \nabla_\omega h_{ij} + 2h(\partial_i,\omega)h(\partial_j,\omega)$):

$$\langle (G_*\omega)_{ij}, N\rangle = \partial_j(\omega^k h_{ik}) - \langle \nabla^{\Sigma}_{G_i}(G_*\omega), \partial_j N\rangle = h_j^k h_{ik} + \omega^k \partial_j(h_{ik}) + h(\partial_j, \nabla_{\partial_i}\omega)$$

$$= (\nabla_\omega h)_{ij} + (h^2)_{ij} + 2h(\omega,\partial_i)h(\omega,\partial_j) + \sum_p h_{ip}h_{jp}$$

$$= (\nabla_\omega h)_{ij} + 2(h^2)_{ij} + 3h(\omega,\partial_i)h(\omega,\partial_j),$$

since $\sum_p h_{ip}h_{jp} = (h^2)_{ij} + h(\omega,\partial_i)h(\omega,\partial_j)$. Combining all the terms yields the result:

$$\partial_t(h_{ij}) = (\nabla dH)(\partial_i,\partial_j) + H\nabla_\omega h_{ij} + H_i h(\omega,\partial_j) + H_j h(\omega,\partial_i)$$

$$+H(h^2)_{ij} + 3Hh(\omega,\partial_i)h(\omega,\partial_j) - Hh(\omega,\omega)h_{ij}.$$

From this expression and Simons' identity (in tensorial form):

$$\nabla dH = \Delta_g h + |h|_g^2 h - Hh^2,$$

we obtain easily a tensorial 'heat equation' for h:

$$[(\partial_t - \Delta_g)h]_{ij} = H\nabla_\omega h_{ij} + H_i h(\omega,\partial_j) + H_j h(\omega,\partial_i) + C_{ij},$$

$$C_{ij} := |h|_g^2 h_{ij} + 3Hh(\partial_i,\omega)h(\partial_j,\omega) - Hh(\omega,\omega)h_{ij}.$$

Using the earlier computation relating $\Delta_g h$ (the tensorial Laplacian of h) and $tr_g d^2 h$, we obtain from this the evolution equation in terms of L:

$$L[h_{ij}] = -2[h_i^k \nabla_\omega h_{jk} + h_j^k \nabla_\omega h_{ik}] + \tilde{C}_{ij},$$

$$\tilde{C}_{ij} := C_{ij} - 2[h(\partial_i,\omega)h^2(\partial_j,\omega) + h^2(\partial_i,\omega)h(\partial_j,\omega)] - 2(h^3)_{ij} - 2(h^2)_{ij}h(\omega,\omega) - 2Hh(\partial_i,\omega)h(\partial_j,\omega)$$

We may also write this purely in terms of the euclidean connection d:

$$L[h_{ij}] = -2[h_i^k d_\omega h_{jk} + h_j^k d_\omega h_{ik}] + \bar{C}_{ij},$$

$$\bar{C}_{ij} = C_{ij} + 2[h(\partial_i,\omega)h^2(\partial_j,\omega) + h^2(\partial_i,\omega)h(\partial_j,\omega)] - 2(h^3)_{ij} - 2(h^2)_{ij}h(\omega,\omega) - 2Hh(\partial_i,\omega)h(\partial_j,\omega)$$

Time derivatives and evolution equations for ω and g.

It is sometimes convenient to use the 'Weingarten operator':

$$S(X) := S(X^i \partial_i) = h^i_j X^j \partial_i.$$

The time derivative of ω is simply minus the time derivative of the $\mathbb{R}^n$ component of N. In addition, one computes easily that $\frac{\nabla v}{v} = S(\omega)$, so we have:

$$\partial_t \omega = \nabla H + \frac{H}{v} \nabla v = \nabla H + HS(\omega).$$

For the metric and 'inverse metric' tensors we have: from $\partial_t g_{ij} = (w_i w_j)_t$ and $w_{it} = (vH)_i$:

$$\partial_t g_{ij} = v^2(H_i \omega^j + H_j \omega^i) + v^2 H(h(\omega, \partial_i)\omega^j + h(\omega, \partial_j)\omega^i),$$

and then, using $\partial_t g^{ij} = -g^{ik} \partial_t g_{kl} g^{lj}$:

$$\partial_t g^{ij} = -[(\nabla H)^i \omega^j + (\nabla H^j)\omega^i] - H[S(\omega)^i \omega^j + S(\omega)^j \omega^i].$$

Since we know the evolution equation of ω, it is easy to obtain that of g^{ij}:

$$L[g^{ij}] = -L[\omega^i \omega^j] = -L[\omega^i]\omega^j + 2g^{kl}(\partial_k \omega^i)(\partial_l \omega^j) - \omega^i L[\omega^j].$$

Using $\partial_k \omega^i = h^i_k$, we find:

$$L[g^{ij}] = -2|h|^2_g \omega^i \omega^j + 2(h^2)^{ij}.$$

It is also easy to see that $\partial_k g^{ij} = -(h^i_k \omega^j + h^j_k \omega^i)$.

Evolution of mean curvature.

To compute the evolution equation for $H = g^{ij} h_{ij}$, we just need to remember g^{ij} is time-dependent:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta_g)H = (\partial_t g^{ij})(h_{ij}) + tr_g[(\partial_t - \Delta_g)h] = -2h(\nabla H, \omega) - 2Hh^2(\omega, \omega) + tr_g[(\partial_t - \Delta_g)h].$$

The result is:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta_g)H = H d_\omega H + |h|^2_g H + Hh^2(\omega, \omega) - H^2 h(\omega, \omega).$$

Since $L[f] = (\partial_t - \Delta_g)f - H d_\omega f$ (for any f), we see that the equation in terms of L has no first-order terms:

$$L[H] = |h|^2_g H + Hh^2(\omega, \omega) - H^2 h(\omega, \omega)$$

Remark. One can also find $L[H]$ starting from the expression:

$$L[g^{ij}h_{ij}] = L[g^{ij}]h_{ij} + g^{ij}L[h_{ij}] - 2g^{kl}(\partial_k g^{ij})(\partial_l h_{ij}).$$

This may be used to check the calculation.

Evolution of the Weingarten operator.

The tensorial Laplacian of S is the $(1,1)$ tensor $\Delta_g S$ with components $\Delta_g h^k_j$. We have:

$$\Delta_g h^k_j = g^{ik}\Delta_g h_{ij}, \quad \text{or } \langle(\Delta_g S)X, Y\rangle_g = (\Delta_g h)(X,Y).$$

The evolution equation is easily obtained:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta_g)h^k_j = (\partial_t g^{ik})h_{ij} + g^{ik}(\partial_t - \Delta_g)h_{ij}$$

$$= H\nabla_\omega h^k_j + H_j h^k_l \omega^l - H_l h^l_j \omega^k + |h|^2_g h^k_j + 2HS(\omega)^k h(\omega, \partial_j) - Hh(\omega,\omega)h^k_j - Hh(S(\omega),\partial_j)\omega^k.$$

Remark: Since the components of ∇S are given by:

$$(\nabla_\omega S)(\partial_j) = (\nabla_\omega h^k_j)\partial_k, \quad \nabla_\omega h^k_j = d_\omega(h^k_j) + h^2(\omega,\partial_j)\omega^k - h(\omega,\partial_j)S(\omega)^k,$$

we see that upon setting $j = k$ and adding over k we recover the evolution equation for H.

The evolution equation for h^k_j in terms of L follows from the calculation:

$$L[h^k_j] = L[g^{ik}]h_{ij} + g^{ik}L[h_{ij}] - 2g^{mn}(\partial_m g^{ik})(\partial_n h_{ij})$$

$$= -2(\nabla_\omega h^k_m)h^m_j + (\partial_j |h|^2_g)\omega^k$$

$$+|h|^2_g h^k_j - Hh(\omega,\omega)h^k_j + HS(\omega)^k h(\partial_j,\omega) + 2h^3(\partial_j,\omega)\omega^k - 2(h^2)^k_p \omega^p h(\partial_j,\omega).$$

Setting $j = k$ and adding over k, we recover the earlier expression for $L[H]$.

Evolution of $|h|^2_g$.

The fact that g^{ij} is time-dependent introduces an additional term in the usual expression:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta_g)|h|^2_g = -2|\nabla h|^2_g + 2\langle h, (\partial_t - \Delta_g)h\rangle_g + 2(\partial_t g^{ij})(h^2)_{ij}.$$

Using the expressions given earlier, one easily finds:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta_g)|h|^2_g = -2|\nabla h|^2_g + Hd_\omega |h|^2_g + 2|h|^4_g - 4Hh^3(\omega,\omega) - 2H|h|^2_g h(\omega,\omega),$$

$$L[|h|^2_g] = -2|\nabla h|^2_g + 2|h|^4_g - 4Hh^3(\omega,\omega) - 2H|h|^2_g h(\omega,\omega).$$

References

[1] Ecker, K.; Huisken, G. *Interior estimates for hypersurfaces moving by mean curvature.* Invent. Math. **105** (1991), no. 3, 547–569.

[2] Ecker, K. *Regularity theory for mean curvature flow.* Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, **57**. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2004. xiv+165 pp. ISBN: 0-8176-3243-3

[3] Eidelman, S. D.; Zhitarashu, N. V. *Parabolic boundary value problems.* Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, 101. Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel, 1998. xii+298 pp. ISBN: 3-7643-2972-6

[4] Guan, B. *Mean curvature motion of nonparametric hypersurfaces with contact angle condition.* Elliptic and parabolic methods in geometry (Minneapolis, MN, 1994), 47–56, A. K. Peters, Wellesley, MA, 1996.

[5] Huisken,G., *Flow by mean curvature of convex surfaces into spheres.* J. Differential Geom. 20 (1984), no. 1, 237–266.

[6] Huisken,G., *Nonparametric mean curvature evolution with boundary conditions.* J. Differential Equations 77 (1989), no. 2, 369–378.

[7] *Evolution of convex lens-shaped networks under curve shortening flow* O. Schnürer, A. Azouani, M. Georgi, J. Hell, N. Jangle, A. Koeller, T. Marxen, S. Ritthaler, M. Sáez, F. Schulze, B. Smith, (Lens Seminar, FU Berlin 2007), arXiv:0711.1108

[8] Lieberman,G.M. *Second Order Parabolic Differential Equations* World Scientific, 1996. xi+439pp. ISBN 981-02-2883-X.

[9] Baconneau, O.; Lunardi, A. *Smooth solutions to a class of free boundary parabolic problems.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **356** (2004), no. 3, 987–1005.

[10] Mantegazza, C., Novaga, M., Tortorelli, V., *Motion by curvature of planar networks.* Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. **5**(3) (2004) no. 2, 235–324.

[11] Mazzeo, R., Sáez, M. *Self-similar expanding solutions of the planar network flow*, arXiv:0704.3113

[12] Protter, M.H., Weinberger, H.F., *Maximum Principles in Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag New York (1984).

[13] Stahl, A. *Convergence of solutions to the mean curvature flow with a Neumann boundary condition.* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **4** (1996), no. 5, 421–441.

[14] Solonnikov, V. A. *Lectures on evolution free boundary problems: classical solutions.* Mathematical aspects of evolving interfaces (Funchal, 2000), 123–175, Lecture Notes in Math., **1812**, Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[15] Struwe, M. *The existence of surfaces of constant mean curvature with free boundaries.* Acta Math. **160** (1988), no. 1-2, 19–64.